DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 250	CE 042 480
TITLE	Employment-Unemployment. Hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, Congress of the United States, Ninety-Ninth Congress, First Session. Part 27. (January 9, February 1, and March 8, 1985).
INSTITUTION	Joint Economic Committee, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	Senate-Hrg-99-98-Pt-27
PUB DATE	85
NOTE	186p.; Document contains small type.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adults; Dislocated Workers; *Employment; *Employment Level; Employment Patterns; *Employment Statistics; Hearings; *Labor Market; Part Time Employment; *Unemployment

ABSTRACT

This document contains three congressional hearings to discuss the data on employment-unemployment released monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Under discussion are the figures for January, February, and March 1985. Testimony includes statements from and discussion among U.S. Senators, U.S. Representatives, and the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. These submissions for the record from the Commissioner are also provided: tables reflecting some unemployment rates, press releases on the employment situation in a given month (December 1984 and January and February 1985), and additional tables illustrating projections of labor force growth, employment status of displaced workers, part-time employment, and the labor market in farm areas. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

S. Hrg. 99-98, Pt. 27

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

ED261250

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

PART 27

JANUARY 9, FEBRUARY 1, AND MARCH 8, 1985

Printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CE042480

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
48-572 O WASHINGTON : 1985

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

[Created pursuant to sec. 5(a) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
PARREN J. MITCHELL, Maryland
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California
CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio
DANIEL E. LUNGREN, California
OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine
BOBBI FIEDLER, California

SENATE

JAMES ABDNOR, South Dakota,
Vice Chairman
WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr., Delaware
STEVEN D. SYMMS, Idaho
MACK MATTINGLY, Georgia
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, New York
PETE WILSON, California
LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas
WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Wisconsin
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland

Scott Lilly, *Executive Director*
Robert J. Tosterud, *Deputy Director*

3

CONTENTS

WITNESSES AND STATEMENTS

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1985

Page

Abdnor, Hon. James, vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement 1

Proxmire, Hon. William, member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement 2

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, accompanied by Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commissioner, Office of Prices and Living Conditions; and Thomas J. Plewes, Associate Commissioner, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics 3

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1985

Obey, Hon. David R., chairman of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement 59

Proxmire, Hon. William, member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement 60

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, accompanied by Thomas J. Plewes, Associate Commissioner, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics 61

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1985

Obey, Hon. David R., chairman of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement 101

Lungren, Hon. Daniel E., member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement 102

Proxmire, Hon. William, member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement 102

Hawkins, Hon. Augustus F., member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement 103

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, accompanied by Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commissioner, Office of Prices and Living Conditions; John E. Bregger, Division Chief, Employment and Unemployment Analysis; and Jerome A. Mark, Associate Commissioner, Office of Productivity and Technology 103

SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1985

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.:

- Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods 5
- Press release No. 85-10 entitled "The Employment Situation: December 1984," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, January 9, 1985 7
- Response to Senator Proxmire's request to supply the current projections of labor force growth 35
- Response to Senator Proxmire's request to supply the employment status of displaced workers by occupation 44

4

Page

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1985

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.:
  Prepared statement 64
  Press release No. 85-50 entitled "The Employment Situation: January 1985," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, February 1, 1985 71

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1985

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.:
  Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods 106
  Press release No. 85-97 entitled "The Employment Situation: February 1985," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, March 8, 1985.. 107
  Response to Representative Obey's request to supply the number of persons employed part time for economic reasons by family relationship 136
  Response to Representative Obey's query regarding the labor market in farm areas 139
  Response to Representative Hawkins' request to supply the employment status of displaced workers by occupation 155
  Response to additional written questions posed by Senator Proxmire 169

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1985

Congress of the United States,
Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:40 a.m., in room SD-106, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. James Abdnor (vice chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Abdnor and Proxmire.

Also present: Robert J. Tosterud, deputy director; Charles H. Bradford, assistant director; and Christopher J. Frenze, professional staff member.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR ABDNOR, VICE CHAIRMAN

Senator **Abdnor**. The committee will come to order.

Ms. Norwood, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to welcome you this morning. On behalf of the members of the Joint Economic Committee, I would like to express appreciation for your testimony before us each month. I would also like to make note of the fact that 1985 marks the beginning of the second century of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, a Government office whose objectivity and integrity is certainly well known and respected.

As I understand it, Commissioner Norwood once again brings us good news. Employment rose 340,000 during the month of December to a level of 106.3 million. More Americans are now working than ever before. The overall outlook for future improvement is positive. The progress made to date is indeed very, very impressive.

At this hearing, we have a complete statistical record of 2 full years of expansion. During this time, over 7 million new jobs have been created, more than during any comparable period of recovery in the post-World War II period. This spectacular economic performance is the wonder of the world. The United States has created more jobs in 2 years than the entire continent of Europe has in at least 10 years.

The decline in the unemployment rate during this expansion has been greater than any decline during the first 2 years of any U.S. recovery since the mid-1950's. Since the index of leading indicators suggests that economic growth is indeed picking up again, we may expect further improvements in the employment outlook. According to many economists, the unemployment rate could fall, and we certainly hope it will fall, below the 7-percent level for the first time since mid-1980.

However, we cannot ignore the fact that the great improvement in the economy and in labor markets over the last 2 years has not been uniform throughout all sectors of society. Nor can we rest until the benefits of a healthy economy are spread to those who are now left out. Though there are a number of such groups, I would like to focus on one of particular interest to me. It remains a fact that despite the optimistic economic outlook, agriculture remains depressed. Defective farm policy, depressed commodity prices, and high interest rates are among the primary causes of this problem. If our desire to extend prosperity to all is to become a reality, we need to urgently address the needs of America's largest single industry—agriculture.

I am extremely pleased to have one of the key members of this committee with a great interest in agriculture here with me. I must believe that he is here because I see his picture in the paper every month——

[Laughter.]

Senator **Abdnor** [continuing]. Because of his great interest in this. It is Senator Proxmire. Senator Proxmire, I am sure you must have something to add.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Senator **Proxmire**. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Vice Chairman; you must read a different paper than I do.

I don't read much about who asks questions at these hearings, and maybe you shouldn't. I think you ought to read about what Ms. Norwood has to say. I think she, after all, is the star for us.

You and I look at this a little differently, Mr. Vice Chairman. It seems to me that the figures show that unemployment went up in December, not down. It went up.

Furthermore, since June there has been no improvement at all in our unemployment figures, and I think that reflects pretty much these figures that we have on growth.

As we know, the third quarter and the fourth quarter were both far different than the first and second quarters of the year. As a matter of fact, we had a very exuberant growth in the first half of the year, and then it slowed down to a pace at which we would not expect unemployment to decline very much or to change very much.

The discouraging fact is that we seem to have bottomed out at an unemployment level of around 7 percent; 7.2 percent is the precise figure.

The leading indicators also, of course, have been erratic for the last 5 or 6 months. For something like 21 months in a row they were favorable, and then for the last 6 months they have been up and down. They are down now below what they were in May.

So in my view, the outlook is not very good, at least for unemployment. If we have the kind of growth that many people anticipate—Fortune magazine, for example, anticipates we will have growth between 2.5 and 3 percent over the next year or so—if we have that, that probably is not enough to reduce the level of unemployment.

If we put the 7-percent unemployment in perspective, it is a very, very high figure historically. It is certainly higher than we had during most of the 1950's, 1960's, even in periods of recession, and higher than most of the time in the last 30 years, with the exception, of course, of the very deep recession we had in 1982.

So I think these figures are not reassuring. I agree with you wholeheartedly on the very, very serious problem for our agriculture, but I think the outlook is not as good as it should be, and it is particularly puzzling and difficult for us because we have to work now—and Congress is dedicated to do this—we have to work now on reducing the deficit. That means we have less stimulus for the economy, and whatever action Congress takes with respect to reducing the deficit is likely to increase unemployment rather than decrease it.

So it is an extraordinarily perplexing and difficult time for economic policy. I am looking forward to whatever recommendations, interpretations the distinguished Ms. Norwood can give us this morning, as you say, as she so often does.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you, Senator Proxmire.

I am sure a lot of what we are talking about will come out in the testimony here, and I am looking forward to hearing from Ms. Norwood. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS; AND THOMAS J. PLEWES, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you very much, Mr. Vice Chairman.

We are always extremely pleased and feel privileged to have this opportunity to discuss the data that we released this morning with the Joint Economic Committee.

As always, I have here at the table with me Kenneth Dalton, who is in charge of our price program, and Thomas Plewes, who is in charge of our employment and unemployment program.

Employment continued to expand in December while unemployment held about steady. The overall jobless rate was 7.1 percent, and the civilian rate was 7.2 percent. Both rates had dropped slightly in the last few months and were down a percentage point from December a year ago. Since the November 1982 recession trough, each jobless rate has come down 3.5 percentage points, and the number of jobless persons has been reduced by 3.7 million.

It should be noted that, according to customary practice, the seasonally adjusted series from the household survey—the source of data on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment—have been revised to incorporate the 1984 seasonal experience. This revision is done routinely because seasonal patterns change over time.

Both the household and business surveys recorded December employment gains in excess of 300,000. With mild weather throughout much of the Nation, construction jobs declined less than is typical in December, producing an increase after seasonal adjustment. Plant holiday closings generally reduce employment in manufacturing in December, and this year the reduction was less than usual. After seasonal adjustment, therefore, factory jobs rose by

85,000. The largest gain was in automobile manufacturing, where employment rose by 25,000. The services industry was up by almost 100,000; it has gained 1 million jobs since December 1983.

Although employment in retail trade was about unchanged in December after seasonal adjustment, 300,000 jobs had been added in this industry in the 2 previous months. Employment in retail trade was up by nearly 1 million from December a year ago.

In the 25 months of the current recovery, more than 7 million jobs have been added by the Nation's business establishments. Two-thirds of this increase has been in the service-producing sector. In the goods producing sector, very few industries had added more than the number of jobs lost during the recession—construction, and within manufacturing, lumber, furniture, electrical and electronic equipment, transportation equipment, and rubber and plastic. Indeed, five of the industries published in our monthly release had employment levels in December that were lower than at the recession low in November 1982—mining and within manufacturing, steel, tobacco, petroleum and coal, and leather.

In December, in addition to the job gains in manufacturing, the factory workweek increased. This series, which usually rises early in recovery periods before employment begins to increase, has remained at historically high levels as the recovery has matured.

Reflecting gains in both employment and hours, the overall index of aggregate hours rose 0.4 percent over the month, and 4.6 percent over the year. The index for manufacturing showed a strong, over the month increase of 1.1 percentage points. In spite of this change, however, the index of aggregate hours in manufacturing is still below the level of the last business cycle peak in July 1981. In contrast, all of the industries within the service-producing sector, except transportation and public utilities, are well above their levels at that time.

While the jobless rate was little changed in December, it has dropped a full percentage point over the past year as the number of jobless declined by 1 million and the number of employed persons advanced by more than 3 million. This employment gain was shared about equally by adult men and women. Sizable expansion took place in managerial, professional, sales, and construction occupations. Virtually all of the expansion took place in full-time jobs. But there has been no reduction in the number of persons working part time for economic reasons.

Because of the interest in this latter category, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has created some new time series which isolate the main causes of involuntary part-time work. One kind, slack work, that is, full-time jobs with hours that have been cut back by the employer; and, second, the inability of a worker to obtain a full-time job. Effective with the data for January, which will be released next month, these new data series will be included in our monthly release. The statistics for December show that there were 2.6 million persons working part time because of slack work, and 2.9 million persons working part time because they were unable to find full-time jobs.

The labor force grew by 2.2 million in 1984, the largest December to December increase since 1979. This increase occurred even though the teenage labor force declined by 160,000. Despite the strong expansion, there has been very little reduction in the number of discouraged workers in the past year. There were still 1.3 million in this group in the fourth quarter of 1984. Blacks continued to comprise a disproportionate share of the discouraged—38 percent in the fourth quarter.

Both blacks and whites have experienced strong declines in their jobless rates over the past year, but at 15 percent in December, the black rate continues to be much higher than the rate for whites. The jobless rate for adult men, which had risen so much during the recession, continued in 1984 to come down more rapidly than the rate for women. In December, their rates were essentially the same—6.3 and 6.4 percent, respectively.

In December, more than 8 million people were unemployed. As I pointed out before, there's a great deal of turnover in the ranks of the unemployed, since each month a considerable proportion of the jobless finds jobs or leave the labor force. They are replaced by others who lose or leave jobs or enter the labor force searching for work. In recent months, the proportion of the jobless who are newly unemployed, that is, jobless for 1 month or less, has been about 40 percent. About 17 percent of the unemployed have been jobless for 6 months, or longer, however. Although the size of this group of long duration unemployed dropped slightly earlier in the year, the number of jobless for 6 months or more has held at 1.4 million since October.

In summary, the statistics for December show continued expansion in employment and the labor force with little change in unemployment. Job gains were widespread, with increases in two-thirds of the industries in the BLS diffusion index. Although the job market recovery slowed during the summer months, the fourth quarter shows improvement. For 1984 as a whole, there were large reductions in most unemployment categories as well as substantial employment increases.

Senator Abdnor, my colleagues and I would be glad to try to answer any of your questions.

[The table attached to Ms. Norwood's statement, together with the press release referred to, follows:]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES OF ALL CIVILIAN WORKERS BY ALTERNATIVE SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODS

Month and year	Unadjusted rate (1)	X-11 ARIMA method: Official procedure (2)	X-11 ARIMA method: Concurrent (3)	X-11 ARIMA method: Stable (4)	X-11 ARIMA method: Total (5)	X-11 ARIMA method: Residual (6)	X-11 method (official method before 1980) (7)	Range (cols. 2-7) (8)
1983								
December	8.0	8.2	8.2	8.3	8.2	8.2	8.2	0.1
1984								
January	8.8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	.1
February	8.4	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	....
March	8.1	7.8	7.8	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.8	.1
April	7.6	7.8	7.8	7.9	7.8	7.7	7.8	.2
May	7.2	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.5	7.8	7.5	.3
June	7.4	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.2	.1

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES OF ALL CIVILIAN WORKERS BY ALTERNATIVE SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODS—Continued

Month and year	Unadjusted rate (1)	X-11 ARIMA method Official procedure (2)	Concurrent (3)	Stable (4)	Total (5)	Residual (6)	X-11 method (official method before 1980) (7)	Range (cols. 2-7) (8)
July	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.5	7.5	7.5	.1
August	7.3	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.5	7.5	7.5	.1
September	7.1	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	...
October	7.0	7.3	7.3	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.3	.1
November	6.9	7.1	7.1	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.1	.1
December	7.0	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.2	7.1	7.1	.2

EXPLANATION OF COLUMN HEADS

(1) Unadjusted rate.—Unemployment rate of all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) Official procedure (X-11 **ARIMA** method).—The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components—agricultural employment, nonagricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 age-sex groups—males and females, ages 16 to 19 and 20 year and over—are seasonally adjusted independently using data from January 1974 forward. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using **ARIMA** [auto-regressive, integrated, moving average] models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then seasonally adjusted with the X-11 **ARIMA** Program. The 4 teenage unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the multiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating that total as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted series are revised at the end of each year. Extrapolated factors for January-June are computed at the beginning of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become available. Each set of 6-mo factors are published in advance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of employment and earnings.

(3) Concurrent (X-11 **ARIMA** method).—The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is seasonally adjusted with the X-11 **ARIMA** program each month as the most recent data become available. Rates for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) Stable (X-11 **ARIMA** method).—Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using **ARIMA** models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year-to-year and computes final seasonal factors as unweighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure, factors are extrapolated in 6-mo intervals and the series are revised at the end of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical to the official procedure.

(5) Total (X-11 **ARIMA** method).—This is one alternative aggregation procedure, in which total unemployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with **ARIMA** models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X-11 part of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unemployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in 6-mo intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(6) Residual (X-11 **ARIMA** method).—This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using **ARIMA** models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted unemployment level is derived by subtracting seasonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-mo intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) X-11 method (official method before 1980).—The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with **ARIMA** models and the factors are projected in 12-mo intervals. The standard X-11 program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

Methods of adjustment.—The X-11 **ARIMA** method was developed at Statistics Canada by the seasonal adjustment and times series staff under the direction of Estela Bee Dagum. The method is described in "The X-11 **ARIMA** Seasonal Adjustment Method," by Estela Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalog No. 12-564E, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in "X-11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program," by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young and John Musgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, January 1985.

News

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1371
523-1944
523-1959
Media contact: 523-1913

USDL 85-10

TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL 8:30 A.M. (EST), WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 9, 1985

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: DECEMBER 1984

Employment continued to rise in December and unemployment was little changed, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. The overall unemployment rate was 7.1 percent, little different from the 7.0 percent in November. The rate for civilian workers, at 7.2 percent, was about the same as November's 7.1 percent (as revised). Each measure has declined by a full percentage point from a year earlier.

Civilian employment--as measured by the monthly survey of households--rose by 340,000 to a level of 106.3 million. The number of nonagricultural payroll jobs--as measured by the monthly survey of establishments--was up by 310,000 to 95.8 million. Each employment series rose sharply in 1984 and has advanced by more than 7.1 million since the November 1982 recession trough.

Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

The number of unemployed persons and the civilian worker unemployment rate were both about unchanged in December. A total of 8.2 million persons were unemployed, 1 million fewer than a year earlier. Most of the decline occurred early in the year, but there was also some improvement in the final quarter. (See table A-2.)

Jobless rates among most major worker groups--including adult men (6.3 percent), adult women (6.6 percent), whites (6.2 percent), blacks (15.0 percent), and Hispanics (10.2 percent)--were essentially unchanged over the month. The jobless rate for teenagers edged up to 18.8 percent in December, about the same as in October. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

The average duration of unemployment was about unchanged in December but was down markedly over the past year. Virtually all of the 1 million

This release incorporates annual revisions in seasonally adjusted unemployment and other labor force series derived from the household survey. The 1984 overall and civilian worker unemployment rates as first computed and as revised, plus additional information on the revisions, appear on page 3.

Centennial
of Labor

decline in unemployment from December 1983 took place among those out of work for 15 weeks or longer. (See table A-7.)

The number of job losers was unchanged over the month but was down about 850,000 over the year. Job losers accounted for about 50 percent of

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

Category	Quarterly averages		Monthly data			Nov.-Dec. change
	1984		1984			
	III	IV	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	
HOUSEHOLD DATA	Thousands of persons					
Labor force 1/	115,464	115,885	115,721	115,773	116,162	389
Total employment 1/	107,016	107,652	107,354	107,631	107,971	340
Civilian labor force	113,754	114,185	114,016	114,074	114,464	390
Civilian employment	105,306	105,951	105,649	105,932	106,273	341
Unemployment	8,447	8,233	8,367	8,142	8,191	49
Not in labor force	62,841	62,948	62,940	63,061	62,842	-219
Discouraged workers	1,211	1,303	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Percent of labor force					
Unemployment rates:						
All workers 1/	7.3	7.1	7.2	7.0	7.1	0.1
All civilian workers	7.4	7.2	7.3	7.1	7.2	0.1
Adult men	6.4	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.3	0.1
Adult women	6.8	6.6	6.9	6.5	6.4	-0.1
Teenagers	18.6	18.4	18.7	17.8	18.8	1.0
White	6.4	6.2	6.3	6.1	6.2	0.1
Black	15.8	15.1	15.3	15.1	15.0	-0.1
Hispanic origin	10.6	10.3	10.7	10.1	10.2	0.1
ESTABLISHMENT DATA	Thousands of jobs					
Nonfarm payroll employment	94,560	95,480p	95,154	95,489p	95,798p	309p
Goods-producing	25,056	25,147p	25,080	25,113p	25,248p	135p
Service-producing	69,504	70,333p	70,074	70,376p	70,550p	174p
	Hours of work					
Average weekly hours:						
Total private nonfarm	35.3	35.2p	35.1	35.2p	35.3p	0.1p
Manufacturing	40.5	40.5p	40.4	40.5p	40.7p	0.2p
Manufacturing overtime	3.3	3.4p	3.3	3.4p	3.4p	0p

1/ Includes the resident Armed Forces. N.A.=not available.
p=preliminary.
NOTE: Household data have been revised based on the experience through December 1984.

the total unemployed in December, compared with 58 percent in December 1983. (See table A-8.)

Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Civilian employment rose by 340,000 to 106.3 million in December, after seasonal adjustment. Most of the over-the-month gain occurred among adult women. Over the past year, civilian employment has risen by 3.2 million; this increase was shared equally by adult men and women. The proportion of the civilian population with jobs--the employment-population ratio--continued to edge upward and, at 59.9 percent in December, was up by 1.1 percentage points during 1984. (See table A-2.)

The civilian labor force expanded by nearly 400,000 in December to 114.5 million. Over the year, the labor force grew by about 2.2 million, and the proportion of the civilian working-age population in the labor force--the labor force participation rate--was 64.6 percent, one-half point above the year-earlier figure. As with the employed, all of the labor force growth for the year took place among adult workers. Teenagers continued to decline, reflecting reductions in their population.

Discouraged Workers (Household Survey Data)

At 1.3 million in the fourth quarter, the number of discouraged workers--persons who report that they want to work but are not looking for jobs because they believe they cannot find any--edged up slightly from the third quarter level. Their number had been trending downward over the past 2 years from the recession high of 1.8 million reached in the fourth quarter of 1982. All of the recent increase occurred among blacks, who continue to comprise a high proportion of the discouraged total. (See table A-13.)

Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Total nonagricultural payroll employment, at 95.8 million, was up by 310,000 in December, seasonally adjusted. Employment growth was widespread, with two-thirds of the industries in the BLS diffusion index registering over-the-month increases. (See tables B-1 and B-6.)

Manufacturing employment rose by 85,000 to 19.8 million. The biggest gain took place in transportation equipment (30,000), mostly due to growth in motor vehicles and equipment. Of the 1.4 million increase in durable goods during the current recovery, 1 out of 5 has been in autos, though employment in the industry was still 150,000 below the 1979 record levels. Moderate December employment gains were also registered, after seasonal adjustment, in the food processing, apparel, fabricated metals, and stone, clay, and glass products industries.

Construction employment fell less than seasonally expected in December, partly because of unusually good weather and, after seasonal adjustment, registered a gain of 55,000. Since the March 1983 low, construction jobs have risen by 655,000.

In the service-producing sector, the services industry continued its rapid job growth, expanding by 95,000. There were also employment gains in wholesale trade (30,000) and finance, insurance, and real estate (20,000). Retail trade employment rose in line with usual December expansion and was about unchanged after seasonal adjustment. There was also little over-the-month change in government and transportation and public utilities.

Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

The average workweek of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls edged up 0.1 hour in December to 35.3 hours. Weekly hours in manufacturing rose by 0.2 hour to a relatively high level of 40.7 hours. Factory overtime was unchanged at 3.4 hours. (See table B-2.)

The index of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls was up 0.4 percent in December to 114.5 (1977=100). The manufacturing index increased by 1.1 percent to 97.0 and was up by 3-1/2 percent over the year. (See table B-5.)

Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings rose 0.7 percent in December, and weekly earnings were up 1 percent, seasonally adjusted. Prior to seasonal adjustment, average hourly earnings increased 4 cents to $8.47, and average weekly earnings were up $4.80 to $300.69. Over the past year, hourly earnings have risen 31 cents and weekly earnings $11.01. (See table B-3.)

The Hourly Earnings Index (Establishment Survey Data)

The Hourly Earnings Index (HEI) was 163.0 (1977=100) in December, seasonally adjusted, an increase of 0.6 percent from November. For the 12 months ended in December, the increase (before seasonal adjustment) was 3.4 percent. The HEI excludes the effects of two types of changes unrelated to underlying wage rate movements--fluctuations in overtime in manufacturing and interindustry employment shifts. In dollars of constant purchasing power, the HEI decreased 0.4 percent during the 12-month period ended in November. (See table B-4.)

Revisions of Seasonally Adjusted Household Survey Data

At the end of each calendar year, the BLS routinely revises the seasonally adjusted labor force series derived from the Current Population Survey (household survey) to incorporate the experience of that year. As a result of the recalculation of the seasonal factors, seasonally adjusted data for the most recent 5 years are subject to revision. (Establishment data are similarly revised concurrent with annual benchmark adjustments about mid-year.)

Table B summarizes the effects of the revisions on the overall and civilian worker unemployment rates in 1984. The 1984 annual averages, 7.4 percent for all workers and 7.5 percent for civilian workers, are not affected by seasonal adjustment revisions. Table C presents revised seasonally adjusted data for major civilian labor force series for December 1983 through December 1984.

The January 1985 issue of Employment and Earnings will contain the new seasonal adjustment factors that will be used to calculate the civilian labor force and other major series for January-June of 1985, a description of the current seasonal adjustment methodology, and revised data for the most recent 13 months or calendar quarters for all regularly published tables containing seasonally adjusted household survey data. Revised monthly data for the entire 1980-84 revision period for 440 labor force series will be published in the February 1985 issue. Historical seasonally adjusted data (monthly and quarterly) from the time of the inception of the various series may be obtained from the Bureau upon request. (Contact Gloria P. Green, (202) 523-1959.)

Table B. Seasonally adjusted unemployment rates in 1984 and change due to revision

Month	As first computed		As revised		Change due to revision	
	Overall	Civilian	Overall	Civilian	Overall	Civilian
January....	7.9	8.0	7.9	8.0	0	0
February...	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.8	0	0
March......	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.8	0	0
April......	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.8	0	0
May........	7.4	7.5	7.4	7.5	0	0
June.......	7.0	7.1	7.1	7.2	0.1	0.1
July.......	7.4	7.5	7.3	7.5	-0.1	0
August.....	7.4	7.5	7.4	7.5	0	0
September..	7.3	7.4	7.2	7.4	-0.1	0
October....	7.3	7.4	7.2	7.3	-0.1	-0.1
November...	7.0	7.2	7.0	7.1	0	-0.1
December...	7.1	7.2	7.1	7.2	0	0

Table C. Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population by sex and age, seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	1983	1984											
	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
TOTAL													
Civilian noninstitutional population1/	175,121	175,333	175,679	175,824	175,969	176,123	176,284	176,440	176,583	176,763	176,956	177,135	177,306
Civilian labor force	112,237	112,320	112,724	112,906	113,202	113,722	113,819	113,868	113,629	113,764	114,016	114,074	114,464
Percent of population	64.1	64.0	64.2	64.2	64.3	64.6	64.7	64.5	64.3	64.4	64.6	64.4	64.6
Employed	103,029	103,294	103,888	104,123	104,402	105,162	105,391	105,377	105,148	105,394	105,649	105,932	106,273
Employment-population ratio2/	58.8	58.9	59.1	59.2	59.3	59.7	59.8	59.7	59.5	59.6	59.7	59.8	59.9
Unemployed	9,208	9,026	8,836	8,783	8,800	8,560	8,228	8,491	8,481	8,370	8,367	8,142	8,191
Unemployment rate	8.2	8.0	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.5	7.2	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.3	7.1	7.2
Men, 20 years and over													
Civilian noninstitutional population1/	75,433	75,692	75,786	75,880	75,973	76,073	76,176	76,269	76,350	76,451	76,565	76,663	76,753
Civilian labor force	59,097	59,285	59,372	59,400	59,474	59,572	59,668	59,730	59,771	59,882	59,913	59,994	60,131
Percent of population	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3
Employed	54,715	55,012	55,233	55,352	55,387	55,663	55,861	55,846	55,935	56,075	56,182	56,269	56,372
Employment-population ratio2/	72.5	72.7	72.9	72.9	72.9	73.2	73.3	73.2	73.3	73.3	73.4	73.4	73.4
Agriculture	2,367	2,367	2,399	2,382	2,446	2,443	2,448	2,444	2,406	2,414	2,334	2,434	2,494
Nonagricultural industries	52,348	52,645	52,834	52,970	52,941	53,220	53,413	53,402	53,529	53,661	53,848	53,835	53,878
Unemployed	4,382	4,273	4,139	4,048	4,087	3,909	3,807	3,884	3,836	3,817	3,731	3,725	3,759
Unemployment rate	7.4	7.2	7.0	6.8	6.9	6.6	6.4	6.5	6.4	6.4	6.2	6.2	6.3
Not in labor force	16,336	16,407	16,414	16,480	16,499	16,501	16,508	16,539	16,579	16,569	16,652	16,669	16,622
Women, 20 years and over													
Civilian noninstitutional population1/	84,666	84,860	84,962	85,064	85,168	85,272	85,380	85,488	85,581	85,688	85,793	85,897	85,995
Civilian labor force	45,099	45,031	45,313	45,482	45,681	46,130	45,958	46,131	46,092	45,950	46,264	46,279	46,463
Percent of population	53.3	53.1	53.3	53.5	53.6	54.1	53.8	54.0	53.9	53.6	53.9	53.9	54.0
Employed	41,872	41,840	42,178	42,334	42,524	43,003	42,986	43,001	42,878	42,906	43,091	43,252	43,511
Employment-population ratio2/	49.5	49.3	49.6	49.8	49.9	50.4	50.3	50.3	50.1	50.1	50.2	50.4	50.6
Agriculture	647	621	627	587	613	603	611	580	573	590	569	580	595
Nonagricultural industries	41,225	41,219	41,551	41,747	41,911	42,400	42,375	42,421	42,305	42,316	42,522	42,672	42,916
Unemployed	3,227	3,191	3,135	3,148	3,161	3,127	2,972	3,130	3,214	3,044	3,173	3,027	2,952
Unemployment rate	7.2	7.1	6.9	6.9	6.9	6.8	6.5	6.8	7.0	6.6	6.9	6.5	6.4
Not in labor force	39,567	39,829	39,649	39,582	39,487	39,142	39,422	39,357	39,489	39,738	39,529	39,618	39,532
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years													
Civilian noninstitutional population1/	15,022	14,981	14,931	14,880	14,828	14,778	14,728	14,683	14,653	14,624	14,598	14,575	14,557
Civilian labor force	8,041	8,004	8,039	8,024	8,043	8,020	7,993	8,007	7,766	7,922	7,839	7,801	7,870
Percent of population	53.5	53.4	53.8	53.9	54.2	54.3	54.3	54.5	53.0	54.2	53.7	53.5	54.1
Employed	6,442	6,442	6,477	6,437	6,491	6,496	6,544	6,530	6,335	6,413	6,376	6,411	6,390
Employment-population ratio2/	42.9	43.0	43.4	43.3	43.8	44.0	44.4	44.5	43.2	43.9	43.7	44.0	43.9
Agriculture	315	306	338	336	320	321	309	309	285	315	266	320	296
Nonagricultural industries	6,127	6,136	6,139	6,101	6,171	6,175	6,235	6,221	6,050	6,098	6,110	6,091	6,094
Unemployed	1,599	1,562	1,562	1,587	1,553	1,524	1,449	1,477	1,431	1,509	1,463	1,390	1,480
Unemployment rate	19.9	19.5	19.4	19.8	19.3	19.0	18.1	18.4	18.4	19.0	18.7	17.8	18.8
Not in labor force	6,981	6,977	6,892	6,856	6,785	6,758	6,735	6,676	6,887	6,702	6,759	6,774	6,687

1/ The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation.

2/ Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Data have been revised based on the experience through December 1984.

Explanatory Note

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey (household survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 60,000 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonagricultural payrolls that appears in the B tables, marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by BLS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes approximately 200,000 establishments employing over 35 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

Coverage, definitions, and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as *unemployed*, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time; and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Also included among the unemployed are persons not looking for work because they were laid off and waiting to be recalled and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days.

The *labor force* equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The *unemployment rate* is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1 and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroll records of nonagricultural firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

> The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey excludes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces.
>
> The household survey includes people on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not.
>
> The household survey is limited to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age.
>
> The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each individual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, employees working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

Seasonal adjustment

Over the course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 95 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity.

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemployment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January-June period and again for the July-December period. The January revision is applied to data that have been published over the previous 5 years. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are calculated only once a year, along with the introduction of new benchmarks which are discussed at the end of the next section.

Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from the surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are approximately 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At approximately the 90-percent level of confidence—the confidence limits used by BLS in its analyses—the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 328,000; for total unemployment it is 220,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.19 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of teenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .26 percentage point; for teenagers, it is 1.25 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment—against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS. It is available for $4.50 per issue or $31.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20204. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M, O, P, and Q of that publication.

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status and sex	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate[3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total employed[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[4]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Agriculture	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate[5]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Not in labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate[3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total employed[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[4]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate[5]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate[3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total employed[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[4]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate[5]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States.

[3] Labor force as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[4] Total employment as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[5] Unemployment as a percent of the labor force (including the resident Armed Forces).

NOTE: Seasonally adjusted data have been revised based on the experience through December 1986.

HOUSEHOLD DATA **HOUSEHOLD DATA**

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Dec. 1983	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Aug. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984
TOTAL									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Agriculture	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Agriculture	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Agriculture	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Seasonally adjusted data have been revised based on the experience through December 1984.

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Dec. 1983	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Aug. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984
WHITE									
Civilian noninstitutional population	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
BLACK									
Civilian noninstitutional population	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
HISPANIC ORIGIN									
Civilian noninstitutional population	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

---

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups. Seasonally adjusted data have been revised based on the experience through December 1984.

Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(Numbers in thousands)

Category	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Dec. 1983	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Aug. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Civilian employed, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married men, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married women, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women who maintain families	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER									
Agriculture:									
Wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Self-employed workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unpaid family workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries:									
Wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Government	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Private industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Private households	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Self-employed workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unpaid family workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PERSONS AT WORK									
Nonagricultural industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Full-time schedules	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Part time for economic reasons	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Usually work full time	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Usually work part time	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Part time for noneconomic reasons	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Excludes persons "with a job but not at work" during the survey period for such reasons as vacation, illness, or industrial dispute.

NOTE: Seasonally adjusted data have been revised based on the experience through December 1984.

Table A-5. Range of unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force, seasonally adjusted

(Percent)

	Measure	Quarterly averages					Monthly data		
		1983	1984				1984		
		IV	I	II	III	IV	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
U-1	Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-2	Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-3	Unemployed persons 25 years and over as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-4	Unemployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-5a	**Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces**	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-5b	**Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force**	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-6	Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons as a percent of the civilian labor force less ½ of the part-time labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-7	Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons plus discouraged workers as a percent of the civilian labor force plus discouraged workers less ½ of the part-time labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

N.A. = not available.

NOTE: Data have been revised based on the experience through December 1984.

Table A-6. Selected unemployment indicators, seasonally adjusted

Category	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	Dec. 1983	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Aug. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984
CHARACTERISTIC									
Total, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married men, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married women, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women who maintain families	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Full-time workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Part-time workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force time lost[2]				[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
INDUSTRY									
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale and retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance and service industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Government workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Agricultural wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

[2] Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force hours.

NOTE: [illegible] through December 1984.

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Weeks of unemployment	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Dec. 1983	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Aug. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984
DURATION									
Less than 5 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
5 to 14 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 to 26 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
27 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Average (mean) duration, in weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Median duration, in weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Less than 5 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
5 to 14 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 to 26 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
27 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

NOTE: Seasonally adjusted [illegible] December 1984.

Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Reason	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED									
Job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
On layoff	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Job leavers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Reentrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New entrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
On layoff	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Job leavers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Reentrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New entrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE									
Job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Job leavers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Reentrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New entrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

Table A-9. Unemployed persons by sex and age, seasonally adjusted

Sex and age	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 17 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
18 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
20 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 to 54 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
55 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 17 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
18 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
20 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 to 54 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
55 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 17 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
18 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
20 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 to 54 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
55 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

[illegible]

Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Dec. 1983	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Aug. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Not in labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Seasonally adjusted data have been revised based on the experience through December 1984.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	Civilian employed		Unemployed		Unemployment rate	
	Dec. 1983	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Dec. 1984
Total, 16 years and over[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Managerial and professional specialty	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Executive, administrative, and managerial	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Professional specialty	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Technical, sales, and administrative support	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Technicians and related support	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Sales occupations	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Administrative support, including clerical	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Service occupations	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Private household	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Protective service	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Service, except private household and protective	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Precision production, craft, and repair	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mechanics and repairers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction trades	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other precision production, craft, and repair	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and material moving occupations	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction laborers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Farming, forestry, and fishing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] [illegible]

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Veteran status and age	Civilian noninstitutional population		Civilian labor force							
			Total		Employed		Unemployed			
							Number		Percent of labor force	
	Dec. 1983	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Dec. 1984
VETERANS										
Total, 25 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	7,238	396	[illegible]	5.3	5.6
25 to 39 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	4,793	[illegible]	316	7.0	6.1
25 to 29 years	[illegible]	198	[illegible]	397	[illegible]	[illegible]	60	47	12.1	11.2
30 to 34 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	160	125	8.6	8.5
35 to 39 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	3,349	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	142	5.8	4.3
40 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	109	[illegible]	5.7	4.5
NONVETERANS										
Total, 25 to 39 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	7.5	[illegible]
25 to 29 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	8.8	[illegible]
30 to 34 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	6.1
35 to 39 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	6.3	4.7

NOTE: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to those 25 to 39 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

Table A-13 Persons not in labor force by reason, sex, and race, quarterly averages

(In thousands)

Reason, sex, and race		Not seasonally adjusted		Seasonally adjusted				
		1983	1984	1983	1984			
		IV	IV	IV	I	II	III	IV
TOTAL								
Total not in labor force		62,958	63,301	62,950	63,029	62,611	62,841	64,969
Do not want a job now		56,953	57,131	56,365	56,809	56,536	57,163	56,394
Current activity	Going to school	8,350	8,097	8,524	8,666	8,656	8,493	8,392
	Ill, disabled	3,700	3,715	3,856	4,000	4,772	4,311	3,764
	Keeping house	28,311	27,749	29,501	28,304	27,980	27,572	27,910
	Retired	12,890	14,308	13,170	13,606	13,646	13,667	10,313
	Other	3,579	3,531	4,046	4,244	4,196	4,519	4,191
Want a job now		5,003	5,901	6,626	6,220	5,994	5,536	6,146
Reason not looking	School attendance	1,491	1,436	1,738	1,555	1,638	1,509	1,451
	Ill health, disability	767	807	813	792	803	475	847
	Home responsibilities	1,299	1,261	1,381	1,455	1,420	1,036	1,382
	Think cannot get a job	1,387	1,254	1,803	1,390	1,235	1,291	1,303
	Job-market factors[1]	969	870	1,244	931	929	965	931
	Personal factors[2]	418	384	800	411	348	326	362
	Other reasons[3]	1,013	1,262	1,380	1,107	1,262	885	1,124
Men								
Total not in labor force		19,958	20,195	19,811	19,706	19,762	19,810	19,847
Do not want a job now		17,534	18,227	17,485	17,070	17,648	17,827	17,761
Want a job now		2,020	1,968	2,181	2,081	2,073	1,991	2,020
Reason not looking	School attendance	794	733	820	810	780	760	736
	Ill health, disability	384	457	373	392	358	307	401
	Think cannot get a job	537	647	600	496	500	466	504
	Other reasons[3]	352	330	351	384	336	340	382
Women								
Total not in labor force		43,000	42,855	43,238	43,283	42,849	43,016	43,122
Do not want a job now		39,419	38,970	39,080	39,143	38,889	39,236	39,639
Want a job now		3,574	3,981	4,133	4,193	3,919	3,961	4,120
Reason not looking	School attendance	699	719	799	739	818	709	707
	Ill health, disability	583	473	481	388	447	441	445
	Home responsibilities	1,259	1,261	1,301	1,455	1,409	1,016	1,384
	Think cannot get a job	850	807	903	894	771	787	807
	Other reasons	658	724	729	713	801	689	744
White								
Total not in labor force		51,800	53,065	53,707	54,005	53,619	53,961	53,933
Do not want a job now		49,417	49,727	49,462	49,501	49,382	49,161	49,529
Want a job now		4,313	4,218	4,509	4,874	4,223	4,279	4,344
Reason not looking	School attendance	1,042	1,061	1,161	1,249	1,128	1,057	1,053
	Ill health, disability	657	641	609	575	593	580	598
	Home responsibilities	967	992	1,091	1,064	870	1,040	1,050
	Think cannot get a job	930	743	933	880	824	800	781
	Other reasons	809	870	861	852	888	776	914
Black								
Total not in labor force		7,442	7,275	7,467	7,400	7,361	7,265	7,238
Do not want a job now		6,030	5,862	5,907	5,905	5,813	5,809	5,723
Want a job now		1,451	1,472	1,513	1,532	1,506	1,470	1,567
Reason not looking	School attendance	409	376	409	469	420	355	374
	Ill health, disability	196	233	186	184	220	223	220
	Home responsibilities	299	264	322	163	288	184	295
	Think cannot get a job	410	406	440	406	408	388	491
	Other reasons	148	173	176	289	139	185	163

[1] Job market factors include "could not find job" and "thinks no job available."

[2] Personal factors include "employers think too young or old," "lacks education or training," and "other personal handicap."

[3] Includes small number of men not looking for work because of home responsibilities.

NOTE: Seasonally adjusted data have been revised based on the experience through December 1984.

Table A-14. Employment status of the civilian population for ten large States

(Numbers in thousands)

State and employment status	Not seasonally adjusted[1]			Seasonally adjusted[2]					
	Dec. 1983	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Dec. 1983	Aug. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984
California									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,956	19,260	19,288	18,956	19,169	19,199	19,230	19,260	19,288
Civilian labor force	12,400	12,753	12,744	12,389	12,665	12,690	12,724	12,708	12,735
Employed	11,408	11,844	11,862	11,388	11,697	11,641	11,775	11,781	11,843
Unemployed	992	909	882	1,001	968	1,049	949	927	892
Unemployment rate	8.0	7.1	6.9	8.1	7.6	8.3	7.5	7.3	7.0
Florida									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,635	8,644	8,663	8,635	8,586	8,606	8,626	8,644	8,663
Civilian labor force	5,101	5,144	5,188	5,097	5,084	5,109	5,066	5,098	5,175
Employed	4,719	4,824	4,872	4,717	4,765	4,804	4,740	4,805	4,872
Unemployed	382	320	316	380	319	305	326	293	303
Unemployment rate	7.5	6.2	6.1	7.5	6.3	6.0	6.4	5.7	5.9
Illinois									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,586	8,608	8,617	8,586	8,580	8,591	8,599	8,608	8,617
Civilian labor force	5,316	5,651	5,626	5,563	5,497	5,567	5,625	5,627	5,668
Employed	4,796	5,196	5,145	5,028	5,018	5,083	5,096	5,147	5,166
Unemployed	520	455	481	535	479	484	529	480	502
Unemployment rate	9.8	8.1	8.5	9.6	8.7	8.7	9.4	8.5	8.9
Massachusetts									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,497	4,521	4,526	4,497	4,511	4,516	4,519	4,521	4,526
Civilian labor force	3,031	3,079	3,057	3,017	3,038	3,059	3,033	3,046	3,049
Employed	2,855	2,973	2,937	2,823	2,883	2,924	2,920	2,915	2,916
Unemployed	176	106	120	194	155	135	113	131	133
Unemployment rate	5.8	3.4	3.9	6.4	5.1	4.4	3.7	4.3	4.4
Michigan									
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,737	6,720	6,719	6,737	6,722	6,721	6,721	6,720	6,719
Civilian labor force	4,215	4,329	4,273	4,241	4,334	4,322	4,359	4,386	4,331
Employed	3,714	3,866	3,821	3,748	3,862	3,848	3,882	3,888	3,876
Unemployed	501	463	452	493	472	474	477	498	455
Unemployment rate	11.9	10.7	10.6	11.6	10.9	11.0	10.9	11.4	10.5
New Jersey									
Civilian noninstitutional population	5,772	5,815	5,819	5,772	5,801	5,806	5,811	5,815	5,819
Civilian labor force	3,758	3,722	3,736	3,762	3,807	3,806	3,788	3,725	3,747
Employed	3,512	3,522	3,535	3,503	3,573	3,568	3,560	3,512	3,536
Unemployed	246	200	201	259	234	238	228	213	211
Unemployment rate	6.5	5.4	5.4	6.9	6.1	6.2	6.0	5.7	5.6
New York									
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,595	13,659	13,665	13,595	13,617	13,644	13,652	13,659	13,665
Civilian labor force	7,951	8,166	8,205	8,056	8,162	8,072	8,203	8,252	8,106
Employed	7,397	7,619	7,673	7,455	7,638	7,507	7,589	7,667	7,528
Unemployed	554	547	532	601	524	565	614	585	578
Unemployment rate	7.0	6.7	6.5	7.5	6.4	7.0	7.5	7.1	7.1
Ohio									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,355	8,354	8,355	8,355	8,350	8,351	8,353	8,354	8,355
Civilian labor force	5,045	5,126	5,093	5,097	5,107	5,148	5,131	5,082	5,156
Employed	4,516	4,671	4,629	4,561	4,598	4,677	4,661	4,637	4,675
Unemployed	529	455	464	536	509	471	470	445	481
Unemployment rate	10.5	8.9	9.1	10.5	10.0	9.2	9.2	8.8	9.3
Pennsylvania									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,196	9,223	9,226	9,196	9,212	9,215	9,219	9,223	9,226
Civilian labor force	5,509	5,591	5,544	5,519	5,451	5,483	5,446	5,503	5,514
Employed	4,947	5,136	5,133	4,943	4,885	4,962	4,955	5,026	5,109
Unemployed	562	455	411	576	566	521	491	477	405
Unemployment rate	10.2	8.1	7.4	10.4	10.4	9.5	9.0	8.7	7.3
Texas									
Civilian noninstitutional population	11,402	11,694	11,722	11,402	11,613	11,638	11,667	11,694	11,722
Civilian labor force	7,731	7,964	8,047	7,743	8,036	8,088	8,047	7,991	8,078
Employed	7,182	7,543	7,597	7,148	7,581	7,638	7,591	7,555	7,640
Unemployed	549	421	450	595	455	450	456	436	438
Unemployment rate	7.1	5.3	5.6	7.7	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.5	5.4

---

[1] These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates used in the administration of Federal fund allocation programs.

The population figures are [illegible] seasonal variation [illegible] in the unadjusted and the seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] [illegible] Revised seasonally adjusted data are not available for States. The seasonally adjusted series will be revised with the release of January data in February.

Table B-1. Employees on nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(In thousands)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Dec. 1983	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984 p	Dec. 1984 p	Dec. 1983	Aug. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984 p	Dec. 1984 p
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total private	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Goods producing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Oil and gas extraction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
General building contractors	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Production workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Production workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Lumber and wood products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Furniture and fixtures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stone, clay, and glass products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Primary metal industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fabricated metal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Machinery, except electrical	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Electrical and electronic equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Motor vehicles and equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Instruments and related products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Miscellaneous manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Production workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Food and kindred products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tobacco manufactures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Textile mill products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Apparel and other textile products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Paper and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Printing and publishing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Chemicals and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Petroleum and coal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leather and leather products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Service producing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Communication and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
General merchandise stores	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Food stores	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Automotive dealers and service stations	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Eating and drinking places	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Insurance	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Business services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Health services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Government	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Federal	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
State	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Local	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

p = preliminary.

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Dec. 1983	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984 p	Dec. 1984 p	Dec. 1983	Aug. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984 p	Dec. 1984 p
Total private	35.5	35.[illegible]	35.3	35.5	35.2	35.3	35.4	35.3	35.2	35.3
Mining	43.4	43.2	43.4	43.6	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Construction	38.0	38.0	37.4	37.6	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing	41.2	41.5	40.7	41.1	40.6	40.5	40.6	40.8	40.5	40.7
Overtime hours	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.4	3.4
Durable goods	42.0	41.3	41.8	42.2	41.1	41.2	41.5	41.3	41.2	41.5
Overtime hours	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.6
Lumber and wood products	39.9	39.3	39.3	40.2	40.9	39.8	40.2	39.3	39.6	39.9
Furniture and fixtures	41.0	41.2	40.1	40.6	40.1	38.1	39.9	39.6	39.8	39.5
Stone, clay, and glass products	41.5	42.3	41.0	41.7	41.5	41.7	41.8	41.8	41.8	41.7
Primary metal industries	40.8	41.0	41.4	42.1	41.8	41.3	41.3	41.1	41.6	41.7
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	41.6	39.8	40.6	41.0	41.2	39.6	40.0	40.1	41.1	41.8
Fabricated metal products	42.3	41.1	41.1	42.5	41.6	41.1	41.5	41.3	41.1	41.7
Machinery, except electrical	42.6	41.7	42.0	42.8	41.5	42.1	42.0	41.9	41.7	41.9
Electrical and electronic equipment	41.9	42.1	41.2	41.8	41.0	40.9	41.2	40.9	41.0	41.0
Transportation equipment	43.1	42.6	42.7	43.7	42.8	42.4	42.8	42.6	43.4	43.9
Motor vehicles and equipment	44.0	43.1	43.3	44.6	43.9	43.1	43.9	43.1	43.3	44.1
Instruments and related products	41.3	41.1	41.6	42.7	40.8	41.1	41.5	41.7	41.6	42.7
Miscellaneous manufacturing	40.0	39.7	39.7	40.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Nondurable goods	40.1	39.6	39.8	40.0	39.7	39.5	39.6	39.3	39.7	39.5
Overtime hours	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.9	[illegible]	3.1
Food and kindred products	39.8	39.8	39.5	40.3	39.8	39.7	39.6	39.8	39.6	39.7
Tobacco manufactures	37.4	38.5	40.5	40.8	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Textile mill products	41.0	39.2	39.6	39.6	40.7	39.4	39.2	38.7	38.9	39.9
Apparel and other textile products	36.7	35.3	36.2	35.3	36.6	[illegible]	35.9	35.5	[illegible]	[illegible]
Paper and allied products	43.7	43.3	43.3	43.9	43.1	43.1	43.1	42.9	43.2	[illegible]
Printing and publishing	38.0	37.9	37.2	38.3	37.7	37.6	37.6	37.9	38.0	37.6
Chemicals and allied products	42.0	41.6	41.4	42.6	41.9	42.0	41.9	41.7	41.9	42.1
Petroleum and coal products	44.6	43.7	43.4	42.8	44.6	43.5	43.1	43.5	43.6	43.5
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	42.4	41.6	41.6	42.0	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Leather and leather products	37.9	[illegible]	36.9	37.6	37.1	36.0	36.5	36.4	36.5	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	39.7	39.2	39.3	39.9	39.6	39.4	39.6	40.1	39.4	39.6
Wholesale trade	38.6	38.7	38.7	39.0	38.8	38.7	38.8	38.6	38.6	38.9
Retail trade	31.4	29.7	29.7	30.3	30.3	29.9	30.0	29.8	29.9	31.1
Finance, insurance, and real estate	36.2	36.5	36.6	36.6	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Services	32.6	32.6	32.6	32.7	32.6	32.6	32.6	32.7	32.7	[illegible]

---

[1] Data relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; to construction workers in construction; and to nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and services. These groups account for approximately four-fifths of the total employees on private nonagricultural payrolls.

[2] This series is not published seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

p = preliminary

Table B-3. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Average hourly earnings				Average weekly earnings			
	Dec. 1983	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984p	Dec. 1984p	Dec. 1983	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984p	Dec. 1984p
Total private	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Seasonally adjusted	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	296.14	[illegible]	299.34
Mining	11.61	11.52	11.57	11.68	[illegible]	497.66	502.14	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	12.14	12.00	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	9.22	9.30	9.39	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Lumber and wood products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Furniture and fixtures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stone, clay, and glass products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Primary metal industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fabricated metal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Machinery, except electrical	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Electrical and electronic equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Motor vehicles and equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Instruments and related products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Miscellaneous manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Food and kindred products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tobacco manufactures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Textile mill products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Apparel and other textile products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Paper and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Printing and publishing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Chemicals and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Petroleum and coal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leather and leather products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary

Table B-4. Hourly Earnings Index for production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted					Seasonally adjusted						
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Percent change from [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Percent change from [illegible]
Total private nonfarm:												
Current dollars	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Constant (1977) dollars	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible] December 1984, the latest month available.

[illegible] December 1984, the latest month available.

[illegible] the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or [illegible] associated with sufficient precision.

Table B-5. Indexes of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

([illegible] = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Dec. [illegible]	Oct. [illegible]	Nov. [illegible] p	Dec. [illegible] p	Dec. [illegible]	Aug. [illegible]	Sept. [illegible]	Oct. [illegible]	Nov. [illegible] p	Dec. [illegible] p
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Goods producing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Lumber and wood products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Furniture and fixtures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stone, clay, and glass products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Primary metal industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fabricated metal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Machinery, except electrical	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Electrical and electronic equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Motor vehicles and equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Instruments and related products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Miscellaneous manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Food and kindred products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tobacco manufactures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Textile mill products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Apparel and other textile products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Paper and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Printing and publishing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Chemicals and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Petroleum and coal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leather and leather products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Service producing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-6. Indexes of diffusion: Percent of industries in which employment[1] increased

Time span	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Over 1-month span	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Over 3-month span	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	
Over 6-month span	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]			
Over 12-month span	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]						

[1] Number of employees, seasonally adjusted, on payrolls of [illegible] private nonagricultural industries.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Figures are the percent of industries with employment rising. (Half of the unchanged components are counted as rising.) Data are centered within the spans.

Senator **Abdnor**. Well, thank you, Ms. Norwood. Thank you for the report. Let me take a second, I think you know a little bit about my background, we've been here before, to express my great concern and interest in rural America, not that I think that economics ought to be about that subject entirely, but, sometimes I think it's been quite eliminated. I'm sure both Senator Proxmire and I show the same concern for the rural area of this country, which, landwise, makes up a huge percentage of the United States. It doesn't have the people, but it's very much a part of our economy.

These issues are important to me. In my new role as vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, I intend to champion some rural issues. Beginning next month, under my instruction, this committee is going to be undertaking a comprehensive initiative evaluating the performance of rural America and the rural economy.

I think sometimes it gets swallowed up in the overall figures that come out and that it's often overshadowed, I think we need to direct some attention to it once in a while.

The agenda that I have in mind is going to cover all facets of rural life, including the economic prospects of rural communities, small businesses, and agriculture. I want to talk about economic development. I want to talk about rural financial and investment resources. I think it is very important that we cover the adequacy of transportation, energy, water, communications, education, health care systems, and other infrastructure needs.

I know that deregulation works well in many parts of the country, but it's ruining and making miserable much of rural America.

The role of technology in rural development must be investigated. There is also the possibility that the condition of State and local government in light of changing Federal fiscal and monetary policy will affect agriculture. I know that public policy toward rural areas in the context of changing rural, urban, and global economies is going to have some very pervasive effects.

Finally, and probably most important, a thorough evaluation of rural labor conditions, prospects, and opportunity is needed. As you know from our discussions, I'm concerned that the Labor Department does not collect data which adequately reflects the true rural labor picture. I think we talked about that a number of months ago in this thing called underemployment. Unemployment is very important but in many cases in rural America, people are earning less than they do on unemployment compensation in many of our cities. Yet, that is not reflected in the kind of figures we report.

In sum, we need to find out more about the rural labor force and we need to find ways to foster greater opportunity for rural America.

I'm going to be inviting you to appear at a special hearing on rural labor issues this spring at which time we can discuss this in greater detail. I'm very excited about pursuing this topic. I have a feeling that Senator Proxmire might have an interest in this area as well.

Senator **Proxmire**. I certainly would. I want to congratulate you, Mr. Vice Chairman, for that initiative. I think we need that. We've neglected the rural area on this committee, I think, and in Congress generally.

You are absolutely right, this is the one area which is in the deepest economic trouble. So I think that these hearings would be most constructive.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you.

Senator Proxmire and I have taken opposite views on this, but isn't it true that you have to go back a long time in your records to find a period of time when so many new jobs have been created, that there were so many new people coming into the labor force?

Didn't I hear you say 340,000 new jobs? Wasn't that it?

Ms. **Norwood**. There clearly is strong growth this month and has been for the last several months. During the recovery, we have had a growth of 7.1 million nonfarm payroll jobs, and that's pretty strong.

During the 1970's, we also had fairly strong growth, but I can give you some of the percentage figures. The civilian employment growth in this recovery period has really been about the same as the strong growth in the seventies, in the 1975 to 1977 period. But both of those were much higher than in earlier recessions.

Senator **Abdnor**. This is because we have so many more people coming into the labor force. I mean that we were probably going along at the rate from the seventies. I don't know. I haven't those figures at my fingertips. But the amount of jobs being created would have to be considered very good.

Am I wrong in thinking that?

Ms. **Norwood**. You're quite correct that the number of jobs that have been created, the job growth, is very large. The labor force growth has somewhat changed in composition in the eighties compared to the previous couple of decades.

You will recall that we had earlier a very large increase of young people coming into the labor force as the result of the baby boom generation. They have now grown up and become more mature members of the labor force. So far in the eighties, a smaller proportion of the labor force is being made up of youngsters than in the past several decades. Based on birth rates, we project a continuation of that trend through the decade.

In addition, in the seventies there was a tremendous expansion of labor force participation by women. That slowed down during the early part of the eighties. It's beginning to pick up again and may well increase even more. It is that the participation of women is high and seems to be moving higher.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you.

Isn't it also true that as time goes by our economy is tied to the world economy more and more? I mean, we've said much about being altogether now, and the importance of trade. I know what's been happening and I'm not happy with the figures on foreign trade. But, considering the world as a whole, this country really is far ahead in the economic picture, isn't it? We've come a long way with the number of people that we're putting to work the way our work force is growing in comparison with other parts of the world and the other leading countries like England and the European economy.

Ms. **Norwood**. Our recovery has been far more vigorous than the recovery in some of the other countries, particularly in Western Europe. And, in fact, if we were to look at unemployment rates and compare the United States to some of our major trading partners—if you set aside Japan, which has a special situation, and perhaps some of the Scandinavian countries, like Sweden, which have very different approaches to labor market policy—the United States has really done better in terms of the level of unemployment rates at the moment, than Canada, France, and the United Kingdom.

Senator **Abdnor**. One last question, then Senator Proxmire may proceed.

I can't think of anybody who doesn't want full employment. That's, of course, everybody's goal. A lot of our problems would be solved, if that was the situation. The President has said on numerous occasions that we should not rest until every American who wants a job has a job.

What is your definition of "full employment," and how far have we gone during the last 2 years toward achieving that objective? How far do we still have to go to get to that point?

Ms. **Norwood**. Senator, I don't have a particular definition of "full employment." I agree with you that we need to have an economy that creates enough jobs so that all people who really vigorously want a job and search for a job an find one.

I think the situation has changed now compared to what we used to talk about when we talked about full employment because we've had a lot of demographic changes. I mentioned before, for example, the decline in the number of young people coming into the labor force. Young people always have very high unemployment rates, partly because they are experimenting with jobs and because they leave the labor force in order to go to school and then come back into the labor force looking for work.

So we should be seeing somewhat less upward pressure on the unemployment rate coming from young people.

There are really two ways that people tend to discuss full employment policy. One is in terms of the labor market and people coming into the labor market finding jobs. And, there, I think we need to look at the composition of the population and their work experience, and composition of the labor force.

The other is by looking at employment and full employment in relation to inflation, what has been called a noninflationary full employment rate. I think there have been some shifts there, of course, because of the successful experience of this country over the last 2 years or so in reducing the rate of price increases.

Senator **Abdnor**. You mentioned the unemployment of youth. I believe your statistics show that from November to December, there was an increase of 1 percent in unemployment among youth?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes, 1 percentage point.

Senator **Abdnor**. That bothers me, because I think busy youth is what we need in this country.

Ms. **Norwood**. Senator, it is true that the unemployment rate for teenagers went from 17.8 to 18.8 percent, but teenagers are a very small group of the population.

Senator **Abdnor**. Yes.

Ms. **Norwood**. And we really need to look at several months of data before determining that that is really an increase.

Senator **Abdnor**. I see.

Ms. **Norwood**. Actually, the unemployment rate for teenagers has held relatively constant over the last 6 months.

Senator**Abdnor**. Thank you, Ms. Norwood. Senator Proxmire.

Senator **Proxmire**. Ms. Norwood, in the last 2 years, since the bottom of the recession, the economy has generated 7 million jobs. And while growth during 1983 and the first half of 1984 was, as I say, very strong, real GNP increased very sluggishly in the last two quarters, as you know. It was a big dropoff.

In the third quarter, when real GNP rose by 1.9 percent, job growth was flat. In the last quarter, when GNP is estimated to have risen by 2.8 percent, jobs grew but grew rather moderately, and in the 6 months as a whole, as I pointed out, unemployment was about the same.

If these slower rates of GNP growth persist, as most people seem to assume they will, how many new jobs will the economy generate per month? And will this be enough to keep unemployment from rising?

Ms. **Norwood**. I don't know the answer to that, Senator Proxmire. We do know that during the period of slower GNP growth, during the summer months, we had actual declines in employment. But, in the fourth quarter, we've had quite a pickup. We've had 300,000 roughly, per month.

So I think that's probably all that I can say. I don't think we really know enough about that. Clearly, GNP growth is tremendously important to employment growth. There's no question about that.

Senator **Proxmire**. Now, all economic advice and, certainly, I share the view that we have to act on the deficit. It's so big, and it threatens to make the national debt and servicing the national debt a burden on the future. Plus the fact that it seems to keep interest rates higher than they otherwise would be. So that almost everybody says we have to act on it.

But, if the Congress should do that, if the Congress should reduce the deficit by, say, $180 billion over the next 4 years, as one proposal by Senator Hollings and Senator Andrews would do, would the effect tend to increase unemployment? And, if so, roughly, how serious would the unemployment increase be?

Ms. **Norwood**. I would think that would depend upon how it was done. One of the things that you need to remember is that there is some long lead time between action and the way it funnels its way through the economy. For example, we have been having rather strong increases in durable orders in recent months. A good portion of that is related to defense expenditures which were really begun many years ago.

And so there is always some of the longer range purchases in the economy which continue to work their way through the economy. And, obviously, as you know much better than I, there are some kinds of actions that are more deflationary than others.

Senator **Proxmire**. Well, if you have—I beg your pardon. Go ahead.

Senator **Abdnor**. As long as you're on the subject, there's something I'd really like to get your views on.

Let's say we do have a package here that reduces the deficit and it's over a 3-year period. Many people have told the Congress that it would have to be at least a 3-year program to really have its effect on confidence seen in the market area.

If it does do that, admittedly we're going to stop growing in some areas of the Government. But if in fact that brought interest rates down, and maybe brought our dollar in line a little closer with other countries currencies and its real value, it might help the balance of trade deficit that we're experiencing today. Couldn't these factors offset slowdown areas of Government?

Ms. **Norwood**. There clearly are many, many offsetting factors, and that's why I said that it really depends on how it is done. And as I understand it, there are a number of simulations that have been going on within the administration, and I would assume, at the Congressional Budget Office, to try to look at alternatives.

Senator **Abdnor**. Well, what do they say 1 billion dollars' worth of foreign trade creates in jobs? Isn't there a formula that can approximate that? Are you familiar with such a thing?

Ms. **Norwood**. There have been formulas which looked at the job creation which might occur if we did not import certain amounts of goods. I don't think those formulas hold up at all.

Senator **Abdnor**. But this could actually create a growth in GNP, couldn't it? If it were stimulated in the right way and if it had the desired effect of reducing interest rates and bringing in more foreign trade? In the long run, GNP could actually grow instead of being reduced? That's what we'd like to see.

Ms. **Norwood**. I'm sure, Senator, there are many, or could be many offsetting factors.

Senator **Abdnor**. OK, I'm sorry I——

Senator **Proxmire**. No, no, that's fine. That's fine. But I think we have to recognize that there's no gain without pain here. If we're going to reduce the deficit, if we're going to increase taxes and cut spending, we have to do both probably in a very big way.

Sure there will be offsetting factors. Interest rates will drop. There's no question that our foreign trade balance will improve. And those will be positive elements. But, on the basis of most past experience, if the Federal Government follows a far less stimulating policy, a drastically less stimulating policy, which we have to do, the effect would tend to slow the economy and slow economic growth down, certainly, with offsetting factors.

And, in the long run, it would be very healthy. But, in the short run, I—some people have said. I'm trying to remember who it was—that short run, in the long run, we're all dead.

At any rate, let me proceed. You reported that labor force growth has been slow during this recovery; since the trough of the 1981-82 recession, the labor force increased by 3.5 million compared with over 5 million during an equivalent period in 1974-75.

Primarily, you have attributed these differences to demographic factors: declining numbers of teenagers in the generations which followed the baby boom, and a leveling off of women's labor force participation rates.

We simply don't have, or shouldn't have expected to have, again, the large influxes of women and young people into the labor force that characterized the 1970's.

At the current pace of labor force growth, how many jobs must the economy create in a year to absorb new entrants to the labor market?

In 1984, civilian employment expanded by 3.2 million. At that rate, can unemployment be reduced much further? And are there any reasons, such as large numbers of discouraged workers, illegal aliens, who expect additional pressures on labor markets' new entrants in the years ahead?

Finally, could some industries, which depend heavily on young workers, be faced with labor shortages as the baby bust generation comes of age?

Ms. NORWOOD. There are a lot of questions there, Senator Proxmire. I think that it's very difficult to know the exact effect on unemployment caused by changes in the labor force because it also depends, of course, as you know, on the number of jobs that are created.

If you'd like, we'd be glad to try to develop a table to insert in the record on our current projections of labor force growth.

Senator PROXMIRE. Yes, I wish you would.

Ms. NORWOOD. We'll be glad to try to do that.

[The information referred to follows:]

Table 1. Civilian labor force, by sex, age, and race, 1970–82, and middle growth projection to 1995

Labor group	Labor force (in thousands)					Participation rate				
	1970	1980	1982	1990	1995	1970	1980	1982	1990	1995
Total, age 16 and over	82,771	106,940	110,204	124,951	131,387	60.4	63.8	64.0	66.9	67.8
Men	51,228	61,453	62,450	67,701	69,970	79.7	77.4	76.6	76.5	76.1
16 to 24	9,725	13,606	13,074	11,274	10,573	69.4	74.4	72.6	74.7	74.5
16 to 19	4,008	4,999	4,470	4,123	4,043	56.1	60.5	56.7	62.3	62.9
20 to 24	5,717	8,607	8,604	7,151	6,530	83.3	85.9	84.9	84.4	84.1
25 to 54	32,213	38,712	40,357	48,180	51,358	95.8	94.2	94.0	93.8	93.4
25 to 34	11,327	16,971	17,793	19,569	18,105	96.4	95.2	94.7	93.7	93.1
35 to 44	10,469	11,836	12,781	17,469	19,446	96.9	95.5	95.3	95.6	95.3
45 to 54	10,417	9,905	9,784	11,142	13,807	94.3	91.2	91.2	91.3	91.1
55 and over	9,291	9,135	9,019	8,247	8,039	55.7	45.6	43.8	37.4	35.3
55 to 64	7,126	7,242	7,174	6,419	6,311	83.0	72.1	70.2	65.5	64.5
65 and over	2,165	1,893	1,845	1,828	1,728	26.8	19.0	17.8	14.9	13.3
Women	31,543	45,487	47,755	57,250	61,417	43.3	51.5	52.6	58.3	60.3
16 to 24	8,121	11,696	11,533	10,813	10,557	51.3	61.9	62.0	69.1	71.6
16 to 19	3,241	4,381	4,056	3,778	3,761	44.0	52.9	51.4	56.8	58.2
20 to 24	4,880	7,315	7,477	7,035	6,796	57.7	68.9	69.8	78.1	82.0
25 to 54	18,208	27,888	30,149	40,495	44,852	50.1	64.0	66.3	75.6	78.7
25 to 34	5,708	12,257	13,393	16,804	16,300	45.0	65.5	68.0	78.1	81.7
35 to 44	5,968	8,627	9,651	14,974	17,427	51.1	65.5	68.0	78.6	82.8
45 to 54	6,532	7,004	7,105	8,716	11,125	54.4	59.9	61.6	67.1	69.5
55 and over	5,213	5,904	6,073	5,941	6,008	25.3	22.8	22.7	20.5	19.9
55 to 64	4,157	4,742	4,888	4,612	4,671	43.0	41.3	41.8	41.5	42.5
65 and over	1,056	1,161	1,185	1,329	1,337	9.7	8.1	7.9	7.4	7.8
White	73,556	93,600	96,143	107,734	112,393	60.2	64.1	64.3	67.3	68.1
Men	46,035	54,473	55,133	59,201	60,757	80.0	78.2	77.4	77.4	77.0
16 to 24	8,546	11,902	11,371	9,854	9,271	70.2	76.7	74.9	78.5	79.1
25 to 54	29,000	34,224	35,565	41,864	44,232	96.3	95.0	94.9	94.8	94.5
55 and over	8,494	8,345	8,197	7,483	7,254	55.8	46.1	44.2	37.8	35.6
Women	27,521	39,127	41,010	48,533	51,636	42.6	51.2	52.4	58.1	60.0
16 to 24	7,141	10,179	10,013	9,285	9,025	58.1	64.4	64.7	72.5	75.4
25 to 54	15,690	23,723	25,619	34,081	37,433	48.9	63.4	66.1	75.6	78.7
55 and over	4,690	5,226	5,378	5,167	5,178	24.9	22.4	22.4	20.1	19.5
Black and other	9,218	13,340	14,062	17,217	18,994	61.8	61.7	61.6	64.8	65.7
Men	5,194	6,980	7,317	8,500	9,213	76.5	71.5	71.0	71.0	70.6
16 to 24	1,185	1,702	1,702	1,420	1,302	64.5	61.6	60.0	55.9	52.7
25 to 54	3,212	4,488	4,792	6,316	7,126	91.9	88.6	88.0	87.6	87.2
55 and over	796	790	822	764	785	54.7	40.8	40.5	34.3	32.8
Women	4,024	6,359	6,745	8,717	9,781	49.5	53.6	53.9	59.7	61.7
16 to 24	982	1,518	1,520	1,528	1,532	48.3	49.3	48.8	53.7	56.3
25 to 54	2,517	4,164	4,529	6,415	7,419	59.2	67.0	67.9	75.8	78.7
55 and over	524	678	695	774	830	30.0	26.4	25.5	23.5	22.8

Source: November 1983, Monthly Labor Review, p. 5.

Ms. **Norwood.** Insofar as shortages are concerned, we do have a fairly healthy capacity utilization rate now. That's, of course, primarily oriented toward manufacturing. And there are, as you know, vast differences there. Many of the young people tend to work in the service-producing sector and there seems to be a tremendous and continuing increase in number of jobs there.

Senator **Proxmire.** How about illegals? Illegal aliens? Switzerland and Germany, I notice, are able to hold down their unemployment rate by exporting their unemployment. When unemployment increases, the people who suffer most and leave most quickly are the people who are only temporarily in the country.

Does the influx of legal aliens, which I understand is very large, does that really affect our unemployment figures?

Ms. **Norwood.** Well, clearly, there are people in the country who are looking for jobs. And anyone who is looking for a job and is available for a job is counted as unemployed. So that I would think that any kind of immigration, whether legal or illegal, does show up in both the employment and unemployment figures.

Senator **Proxmire.** There wasn't that much discussion of that. And I just wonder, because of the speculation that it's very, very big, that it involves hundreds of thousands, perhaps even millions of people, moving in or out, or particularly moving in, if it is a factor that we ought to be more sensitive to.

Ms. **Norwood.** We, in a measurement sense, a technical sense, we are very sensitive to that issue and we do the best job that we can to try to be sure that we can count them. In the household survey, I think we probably do get both people who are here legally and those who are here illegally, but cannot separate them. To my knowledge, there is no really good figure on the number of illegal aliens who are in this country.

It is quite clear that there are special problems in particular localities. If we look at our southern border with Mexico, if we look at some of the problems in the State of Florida, and so on, it is quite clear that the employment situation is affected by the immigration, whether legal or illegal, that occurs.

Senator **Proxmire.** Now, your figures on discouraged workers are a pessimistic element here. I notice that in the first quarter of the year there were 1,350; the second quarter, that dropped to 1,275; and the third quarter, it dropped again to 1,211. In this quarter, it increased almost back up to the level of the first quarter, 1,303,000. That figure should be going down, it seems to me, although the behavior of that group tends to be cyclical and the number of discouraged workers has been falling since the trough of the recession, as I say, that category increased.

Is the current level of discouraged workers high by historic standards? And why, after 2 years of recovery, did so many people assume no jobs are available for them?

Are discouraged workers geographically concentrated in States with high unemployment, or in severely depressed areas within States?

Ms. **Norwood.** Discouraged workers are disproportionately black. To a lesser extent, they are disproportionately female. They tend to be people who have a harder time in the labor force. They also tend to be people, so far as we've been able to make out, who are living in, as the chairman indicated, some of the rural areas of the country, and in some of the central cities.

But I think that it is basically the lack of skills and the difficulties that these people have in the labor market that is characteristic——

Senator **Proxmire**. Why has it gone up in the last quarter?

Mr. **Plewes**. It went up just slightly. We don't know why.

Senator **Proxmire**. But it went up almost 100,000.

Mr. **Plewes**. The question is: Why it didn't go down, as it usually does at this stage of the recovery?

Senator **Proxmire**. That's right. Instead of going down, it went up and it went up rather substantially.

Mr. **Plewes**. That's correct.

Senator **Abdnor**. Just for the record, at what point are you considered a discouraged worker?

Ms. **Norwood**. A discouraged worker is—it's a fairly soft figure in terms of the definition, by the way. But, a discouraged worker is one who says, "I'm available for work but I'm not looking for work. The reason I'm not looking for work is because I just don't think any job would be available."

And so he or she is not counted in the unemployment figures, because in order to be counted, there must have been a search for work. And a discouraged worker hasn't searched.

Senator **Abdnor**. Were these monthly figures that you presented to Senator Proxmire?

Senator **Proxmire**. No, it was a quarter. From the third quarter to the fourth quarter, it increased from 1,211,000 to 1,303,000, which is an increase of about 100,000.

Senator **Abdnor**. Well, that would make 100,000 people in a 3-month period discouraged workers. Is that right?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes. In the last quarter, there was a net increase of 100,000 in the number of discouraged workers. Senator Proxmire is right that, generally, what you expect to happen is that as the recovery gains momentum, and as there are more jobs created and more and more people come into the labor market and begin looking for jobs, then the number who were discouraged goes down because these people see that there are job possibilities.

I think there is a problem of geographic location for some of them. You don't suddenly become encouraged if you know there are jobs several hundred miles from you, for example, or where you can't go.

Senator **Abdnor**. But, I ask the question, are most of those people unskilled workers or skilled? Or might it be a mixture?

Ms. **Norwood**. Many of them are unskilled workers. Many of them are minorities.

Senator **Abdnor**. This time of the year, when you go into the winter months things slow down. People are hesitant to start up new building, new construction, et cetera.

Just for clarification, doesn't this occur almost every year in this period of time?

Senator **Proxmire**. I take it, you knock the seasonal factors out?

Senator **Abdnor**. I would assume you do.

Senator **Proxmire**. I presume you do.

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes, we do try to take account of the seasonal variation. Now, of course, there may be some shifts. The weather may be milder than usual, or it may be worse than usual. It is a sticky figure. I think that's quite clear.

Senator **Proxmire**. Now, the reason I raise this is because the discouraged workers, it seems to me, might be at least taken into account when you look at the unemployment figures. Some people would just add them on and say, "You not only have the people who can't find work, you have people who are too discouraged to look."

Now, in addition to this, in December, 5.6 million who wanted to work full time could only find part-time jobs. You report that this number has been rising and explain that the group is divided almost evenly between people in slack work situations and people who can't find full-time jobs.

And part of these developments reflect employer caution about the durability of the recovery, in line with indications that firms are allowing more on temporary help than they did in the past.

Ms. **Norwood**. I think that's true. I think it also fits together with the data we have on factory hours, which are really at a very high level for this stage of recovery. I think employers are being very cautious. They don't want to increase their unit labor costs by taking on all of the additional costs, the fringe benefit costs. They are concerned, having seen some of the bankruptcy figures; they just want to be very, very careful to make their work force as efficient as possible.

And the way some of them are doing this, I believe, is by hiring people on contract and on a temporary basis. In fact, if you look at the number of jobs that have been created in business services, which include organizations which find workers, one out of every eight jobs created during the recovery was in business services. I think there's a lot of that going on.

I might add, Senator Proxmire, that I have become increasingly concerned about our interpretation of some of these data. We are certainly seeing a very strong shift away from the goods-producing sector to services in this country; and even within goods-producing, we're seeing big shifts occurring among individual industries.

Senator **Proxmire**. But, certainly, when you take a look at the fact that unemployment did go up, although rather slightly, in December, discouraged workers in the last quarter is up, and the involuntary part-time workers is also up, and that's up by 200,000, it would seem to me that the situation for people desiring full-time work is not good, it's bad. And that these latter figures underline it.

Ms. **Norwood**. As you know, we have a table in our press release which shows unemployment rates which go from a little over 2 to 10.8 percent, depending on which groups you want to count as unemployed and which groups you want to include as part of the labor force. And there is no question but that there are groups that we need to pay some attention to.

Senator **Proxmire**. Now, the unemployment rate among blacks was 15 percent in December compared to 6.2 percent for whites. That's 15 percent, 2½ times higher for blacks than for whites. That was down considerably from the worst point in the recession when it was 21 percent. The gap between blacks and whites is actually wider now. That's unusual. Why is that? Why is this situation so much worse for blacks than it usually has been when you have the unemployment situation improving?

Ms. NORWOOD. I prefer to look at it, Senator Proxmire, in terms of what is actually happening to blacks and what is actually happening to whites. During this recovery period the labor force for the black population has increased by about 800,000 and their employment has increased by about 1,300,000. So that there has been a considerable drop in the number of people who are unemployed.

I think it is important to note that black employment has increased by 14 percent during the recovery period compared to 6 percent for whites.

The black population in this country continues to have difficulty in the labor market but its situation has improved considerably during recovery.

Senator PROXMIRE. My time is up.

Senator ABDNOR. Thank you.

Ms. Norwood, as you know many economists have argued that each postwar business cycle has been accompanied by higher rates of unemployment than the preceding one. Can that be said of the current expansion?

Ms. NORWOOD. There has generally been an upward trend in the unemployment rate, yes.

We have had a sharper decline in unemployment in this recovery than in others, but, of course, we started from a much higher rate of unemployment prior to the recession.

Senator ABDNOR. Also in your statement you note that employment in the auto industry rose 25,000 in December?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Senator ABDNOR. What is the unemployment rate in the industry now? What was it in December 1982? This is one of the bright areas; isn't it?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's 4.1 percent now, and it was 21.6 percent in December 1982. It's been coming down pretty steadily.

Now one needs to be careful in interpreting that because, of course, these are people who tell us that their last job was in the auto industry. There are, of course, many people who worked in the automobile industry who lost their jobs then got other jobs for a while and became unemployed again. They would not be counted in our figures as unemployed auto workers.

With that definition, workers in the automobile industry have seen a considerable improvement in their unemployment rate in the last quarter of 1984.

Senator ABDNOR. Senator Proxmire mentioned adult men and other factors. The labor force participation rate for adult men has, at least until recently, trended downward since the mid-1960's. Now, how would you interpret this current trend? Is that leveling off now?

Ms. NORWOOD. The labor force participation rate of adult men seems to have been remarkably stable this year. It's at 78.3. That is considerably less than in the early 1970's when it was over 80 percent and in the early 1960's when it was above 85 percent. We could even go back to the 1950's and the 1940's, when it was around 88 percent.

But it has held pretty stable over the last 2 or 3 years.

Senator **Abdnor**. What's the percentage of employment?

Ms. **Norwood**. The labor force participation rate for adult men is 78.3 percent. Their unemployment rate in December was 6.3 percent.

Senator **Abdnor**. Let me jump over to rural America once more. I just can't get off of that subject.

Senator **Proxmire**. Farmers have real friends.

Senator **Abdnor**. I hope so. How would you evaluate the strength and the weaknesses of the present labor data collection processes that pertain to the metropolitan areas, and rural areas. How effective are they in the rural areas?

Ms. **Norwood**. The data system is affected a great deal by the numbers of people in particular industries and in particular areas. The smaller numbers and the more widespread they are the more expensive it is to provide accurate data. And I think that's one of the difficulties we have with data for rural areas.

The Agriculture Department has a very effective statistical reporting service. We work very closely with them. They have contracts with the State farm agencies in each of the States and do a great deal of data collection there.

Our basic survey of business establishments is nonagricultural so that we do not have any data in our basic business survey except for, of course, the manufacturing of agricultural products.

Our household survey does include the rural population but I think we have to understand what we're talking about is a sample of roughly 60,000 households and when you break that down to the smaller groups of the population, the data are not as comprehensive as we would like them to be.

In the consumer price area, for example, our pricing for the Consumer Price Index is limited entirely to urban areas.

There have been many discussions within the Government over the years that I've been in the Bureau of Labor Statistics about expanding those data and expanding those data collection programs. There is always the problem, of course, that costs increase.

Senator **Abdnor**. I'm sure, but there are ways we could improve rural data if we were willing to invest the dollars into different programs to make it possible. I would venture to say that there must be big shifts in the percentages of unemployment and employment in rural America in the different sections of the United States. It must change considerably from one part of the country to the other. Have you noticed any of that in your——

Ms. **Norwood**. There are extraordinary shifts from one place to another because economic conditions are different from one local area to another. I think we have several problems with the data on the rural population. One is that local data are difficult to produce, they are extraordinarily expensive to get with any real accuracy. The cheapest way is to go through the tax records or to business establishment payrolls which don't give you much help with the farm population.

So that's a problem. And then the second problem in the rural labor market is that there is a lot of seasonal work and a lot of underemployment that is difficult to measure.

We have had a number of conversations and have worked with members of the statistical staffs of other countries particularly some of the developing countries where there is a primarily rural sector. And there really is yet a long way to go I think in handling, defining, and measuring underemployment.

Senator ABDNOR. I won't take the time now but I'd like to pursue this with you some other time when I have you back for that single purpose.

Ms. NORWOOD. I'd be glad to.

Senator ABDNOR. Because it is a subject of great concern to me.

We're always talking about unemployment and employment and I just don't think it really reflects the true picture in some parts of the country.

For instance, right now we have quite an expansion in the nonagricultural employment throughout the Nation, and yet I don't think that's going to be necessarily true in agricultural areas. If it is a chosen employ, it's going to be at a far different salary and a base than what you'd find throughout the country as a whole.

Ms. NORWOOD. The data that we do have, Senator, show rather remarkable stability in employment in agriculture over the last couple of years.

Senator ABDNOR. Just for the record could you please review the major differences between the household and the establishment surveys. I understand that the establishment survey is less comprehensive; is that right? It excludes agriculture, the self-employed and the unpaid family workers, among others. These don't show up in establishment surveys; do they?

Ms. NORWOOD. That is correct. There are definitional differences.

The household survey is designed as a basic labor force survey which includes the total population of the country and as we've said, it is sometimes hard to break out some of the smaller groups though we do have a rather extensive system of demographic data.

The establishment survey is based upon payroll records of nonagricultural establishments. There are differences in concept. The household survey is based upon a person concept. We go out to a household and ask people if they have work. If somebody has worked at, say, two or three jobs he is counted as once employed. But if someone has worked at two or three different places he would be counted several times—once for each establishment on the payroll records. So there are very definite definitional differences between the two surveys.

Senator ABDNOR. How could we bring them together?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, with great difficulty. And they sometimes do depart from each other. Generally over the long run we have found that they track pretty well when you take account of the differences. If you look at them over the year, for example, the two surveys are really fairly close particularly when you adjust for the conceptual differences. They're within several hundred thousand over the year and that's pretty good.

I like to think, Senator, that we in this country are extremely lucky because we have two independent observations to determine what is happening to employment growth, unlike other countries.

I can tell you that when those numbers from the two surveys differ a great deal and I have to come up here and tell you what I think is happening, I may have a little bit of a different view of it.

But I do think it's very much in the public interest for such an important phenomenon as employment to have two different kinds of measurements.

Senator **Abdnor**. Well it certainly serves as a check for you.

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes.

Senator **Proxmire**. Ms. Norwood, I should have asked that question at the beginning because it seems to me it's very important for us, especially in a month like December that has its seasonal changes, to get your answer on it.

The survey week normally includes the 12th day of the month and it came a week early in December. Therefore, it might not have picked up some of the people who were hired for the Christmas period. Could the timing of the survey have affected the seasonally adjusted data in any way?

Ms. **Norwood**. Almost anything, of course, can affect the seasonal adjustment process but the timing of the household survey for December has been the same each year. That is, in December it is moved up because of the Christmas period and because of the difficulties, the processing, and it is not something that just happened this year.

Senator **Proxmire**. Well, this is not the same. Unless I'm misinformed I understand that the survey week normally includes the 12th day of the month.

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes.

Senator **Proxmire**. It does not do that in December, normally?

Ms. **Norwood**. That's right. It does not do that in December, normally.

Senator **Proxmire**. I see.

Ms. **Norwood**. It's rare.

Senator **Proxmire**. So that in Decembers in the past you've had that?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes.

Senator **Proxmire**. You don't feel uneasy about the fact that this is early in the month and, therefore, some of the people hired to take care of the Christmas rush, for example, might not be included?

Ms. **Norwood**. Not especially, no. One of the things that's been happening if you look at retail trade, as I said in my statement, there was a considerable increase in October and November in retail trade. The fact that it didn't pick up much in December, I think, needs to be looked at in terms of what happened in October and November as well.

Senator **Proxmire**. Toward the end of last year a special report by BLS showed that 5.1 million workers were displaced in long-term jobs between January 1979 and January 1984.

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes.

Senator **Proxmire**. Forty percent of these workers, or 2 million people, were unable to find new jobs; 40 percent.

Some of those who did had to accept lower pay than they had previously earned or fewer hours of work than they wanted.

On the issue of wages the study showed that about 45 percent of displaced workers who found new full-time jobs earned less than they did in their previous jobs. Roughly 30 percent of reemployed displaced workers had to take pay cuts of 20 percent or more.

Now, in which industries or occupations were the prospects of finding a new job with equivalent pay and benefits the best?

Ms. NORWOOD. We have that press release with us. That information is shown in table 7 of the release which we will supply for the record.

Senator PROXMIRE. All right, will you supply that for the record, then, for which are the best and which are the poorest? And then most of the workers that settled for pay cuts tend to have new jobs in service industries or in different areas of manufacturing?

[The press release referred to follows:]

News

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1821 USDL 84-492
523-1959

Media contact: 523-1913 FOR RELEASE: IMMEDIATE
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1984

BLS REPORTS ON DISPLACED WORKERS

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor has completed a special study of workers whose jobs were abolished or plants shut down between January 1979 and January 1984.

The study shows that of 5.1 million workers who had been at their jobs at least 3 years before they were displaced, 60 percent (3.1 million) were reemployed when surveyed in January 1984, though many at lower pay; about 25 percent (1.3 million) were looking for work and the rest (700,000) had left the labor force.

Among the displaced workers who were reemployed, about 360,000 who had previously been in full-time wage and salary jobs were in part-time jobs when surveyed. Among those who were once again in full-time jobs--and reported earnings for both the old and new jobs--about 45 percent were earning less in the new job than in the one they had lost.

A displaced worker, as defined in this study, is one who (1) lost a job between January 1979 and January 1984, (2) had worked at least three years in that job, and (3) lost it because of the closing down or moving of a plant or company, slack work, or the abolishment of a position or shift.

The survey on which this study is based was sponsored by the Employment and Training Administration and was conducted as a supplement to the January 1984 Current Population Survey. (For a description of the supplement, see the explanatory note on page 4.) Altogether, a total of 11.5 million workers 20 years of age and over were identified in this survey as having lost jobs during the January 1979-January 1984 period because of one of the three factors listed above. However, a large number of these workers had been at their jobs only a relatively short period when the loss occurred, with 4.4 million reporting one year or less of tenure on the lost job. To focus on workers who had developed a relatively firm attachment to the jobs they lost, only those with a minimum of 3 years of tenure are included in this analysis, and the data presented in tables 1 through 7 relate only to these 5.1 million workers.

Employment status in January 1984

The chance of reemployment for these displaced workers declined significantly with age. While the overall proportion who were employed in January 1984 was 60 percent, this varied from 70 percent for those 20 to 24 years of age to 41 percent for those 55 to 64 years of age. Those 65 years and over often retire when they lose a job, so the proportion in this age

Centennial
of Labor
Statistics

group who were employed in January 1984 was only 21 percent. (See table 1.)

Over one-fourth of the displaced workers 55 to 64 years of age and as many as two-thirds of those 65 years and over were out of the labor force--that is, were neither employed nor unemployed--when studied. Women in general were somewhat less likely than men to be reemployed and more likely to have left the labor force.

Of the 5.1 million workers who had lost a job over the previous 5 years, about 1.3 million, or one-fourth, were unemployed when surveyed in January 1984. The proportion unemployed was about 23 percent among whites, 41 percent among blacks, and 34 percent among Hispanics.

Reasons for displacement

Almost one-half (49.0 percent) of the 5.1 million workers reported they had lost their jobs because their plant or company had closed down or moved. Another two-fifths (38.7 percent) cited "slack work" as the reason. The balance (12.4 percent) reported that their position or shift had been abolished. (See table 2.) The older the worker, the more likely was the job loss to stem from plant closings. Younger workers, having generally less seniority, were about as likely to have lost their jobs due to slack work as due to plant closings.

Years worked on lost job

Many of the 5.1 million displaced workers had been in their jobs for relatively long periods. Nearly one-third (30.2 percent) had been displaced from jobs on which they had worked 10 years or more. Another third (33.6 percent) had been on their jobs from 5 to 9 years. The remainder had lost jobs at which they had worked either 3 or 4 years. The median tenure on the lost jobs for the entire 5.1 million workers was 6.1 years. Not surprisingly, the length of tenure tended to increase with the age of the displaced workers. For example, median tenure for those 55 to 64 had been 12.4 years. (See table 3.)

Industry and occupation

Nearly 2.5 million, or almost one half of the workers in question, had been displaced from jobs in the manufacturing sector, principally in durable goods industries. (See table 4.) About 220,000 had worked in primary metals, 400,000 in machinery, except electrical, and 350,000 in the transportation equipment industry, with autos accounting for 225,000.

Of the workers who had lost jobs in the primary metals industry, less than half (45.7 percent) were employed in January 1984, and nearly two-fifths (38.7 percent) were still reported as unemployed. Of those who had lost jobs in the nonelectrical machinery industry or the transportation equipment industry, the proportion employed in Ja[illegible] 1984 was over 60 percent.

From an occupational standpoint, operators, fabricators, and laborers figured most prominently among the workers who had been displaced from jobs. (See table 5.) In general, the higher the skill of the displaced workers, the more likely they were to be reemployed when surveyed. For example, among those who had been displaced from managerial and professional jobs, the proportion reemployed was about 75 percent. In contrast, among those who had lost jobs as handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers, less than one-half were reemployed.

Geographic distribution

Relatively large numbers of the workers who had been displaced from their jobs resided in the East North Central (1.2 million) and the Middle Atlantic (800,000) areas. (See table 6 for definitions of these areas.) This reflects in part the concentration of heavy industries in these two areas and the employment losses which these industries incurred in recent years. As shown in table 6, the workers who had been displaced in these two areas were less likely than those in other areas to be reemployed when surveyed in January 1984. Whereas the nationwide proportion who were reemployed was three-fifths, it was only about one-half in these two areas. The East North Central area had nearly one-third of all the displaced workers who were unemployed in January 1984--400,000 out of a national total of 1.3 million--and nearly one-half of those in the East North Central area had been unemployed for more than 6 months.

Earnings on new job

Of the 3.1 million displaced workers who were again employed in January 1984, a little over 2.8 million had previously held full-time wage and salary jobs. Of these, nearly 2.3 million, were once again working in full-time wage and salary jobs when surveyed. Earnings data for about 2 million of these workers were obtained both for the old and new jobs.

About 1.1 million (55 percent) of these 2 million workers reported weekly earnings from their new jobs that were equal to or higher than the earnings on the jobs they had lost, with 300,000 reporting that their earnings exceeded those on their previous jobs by 20 percent or more. On the other hand, about 900,000 (45 percent) reported earnings that were lower than those on the jobs they had lost, with about 600,000 having taken cuts of 20 percent or more. (See table 7.)

Workers who had been displaced from jobs in durable goods manufacturing were somewhat more likely than other workers to be earning less on the jobs they held in January 1984 than in those they had lost. About 40 percent of those who were in new full-time wage and salary jobs when surveyed in January 1984 reported weekly earnings of 20 percent or more below those on the jobs they had lost.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The data presented in this report were obtained through a special survey conducted in January 1984 as a supplement to the Current Population Survey, the monthly survey which provides the basic data on employment and unemployment for the Nation. The purpose of this supplementary survey was to obtain information on the number and characteristics of workers 20 years of age and over who had been displaced from their jobs over the previous 5 years, that is, over the period from January 1979 to January 1984. This is the period during which the economy went through two back-to-back recessions and the levels of employment in some industries, particularly the goods-producing sector, were reduced considerably.

In order to identify workers who had been displaced from jobs, the survey respondents were first asked whether the household member had lost a job during the period in question "because of a plant closing, an employer going out of business, a layoff from which (he/she) was not recalled, or other similar reasons." If the answer to this question was "yes", the respondent was asked to identify, among the following reasons, the one which best fit the reason for the job loss:

- Plant or company closed down or moved
- Plant or company was operating but job was lost because of:
  - Slack work
  - Position or shift was abolished
  - Seasonal job was completed
- Self-employment business failed
- Other reasons

After ascertaining the reason for the job loss, a series of questions were asked about the nature of the lost job--including the year it was lost, the years of tenure, the earnings, and the availability of health insurance. Other questions were asked to determine what transpired after the job loss such as: How long did the person go without work, did he or she receive unemployment insurance benefits, were the benefits exhausted, and, finally, did the person move after the job loss. If the person was reemployed at the time of the interview, follow-up questions were asked to determine the current earnings. And, regardless of the employment status at the time of the interview, a question was asked of all those who had been reported as having lost a job to determine whether they currently had any health insurance coverage.

As noted earlier, in tabulating the data from this survey the only workers considered to have been displaced from their jobs were those who reported job losses arising from: (1) The closing down or moving of a plant or company, (2) slack work, or (3) the abolishment of their position or shift. This means that workers whose job losses stemmed from the completion of seasonal work, the failure of self-employment businesses, or other miscellaneous reasons were not included among those deemed to have been displaced. A further condition for inclusion among the displaced workers for the purpose of this study was tenure of at least 3 years on the lost job.

In examining the displaced workers who were unemployed in January 1984, it is important to note that not all were continually unemployed since the job loss they reported. Many, particularly those who reported job losses which occurred in 1979 or the very early 1980's, may subsequently have held other jobs, only to find themselves unemployed once again in January 1984.

More detailed analysis of the data from this supplement, including topics not covered in this release, will be forthcoming.

Table 1. Employment status of displaced workers by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin, January 1984

(Percent)

Age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin	Total 1/ (thousands)	Total	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the labor force
TOTAL					
Total, 20 years and over	5,091	100.0	60.1	25.5	14.4
20 to 24 years	342	100.0	70.4	20.2	9.4
25 to 54 years	3,809	100.0	64.9	25.4	9.6
55 to 64 years	748	100.0	40.8	31.8	27.4
65 years and over	191	100.0	20.8	12.1	67.1
Men					
Total, 20 years and over	3,328	100.0	63.6	27.1	9.2
20 to 24 years	204	100.0	72.2	21.7	6.1
25 to 54 years	2,570	100.0	68.2	26.8	5.0
55 to 64 years	461	100.0	43.6	34.1	22.3
65 years and over	92	100.0	16.8	12.9	70.3
Women					
Total, 20 years and over	1,763	100.0	53.4	22.5	24.2
20 to 24 years	138	100.0	67.8	18.0	14.2
25 to 54 years	1,239	100.0	58.0	22.4	19.6
55 to 64 years	287	100.0	36.3	28.0	35.7
65 years and over	99	100.0	24.6	11.3	64.1
WHITE					
Total, 20 years and over	4,397	100.0	62.6	23.4	13.9
Men	2,913	100.0	66.1	25.1	8.8
Women	1,484	100.0	55.8	20.2	24.1
BLACK					
Total, 20 years and over	602	100.0	41.8	41.0	17.1
Men	358	100.0	43.9	44.7	11.4
Women	244	100.0	38.8	35.6	25.6
HISPANIC ORIGIN					
Total, 20 years and over	282	100.0	52.2	33.7	14.1
Men	189	100.0	55.2	35.5	9.3
Women	93	100.0	46.3	30.0	23.6

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table 2. Workers who were displaced from jobs between January 1979 and January 1984 by age, sex, race, Hispanic origin, and reason for job loss

(Percent)

Age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin	Total 1/ (thousands)	Total	Plant or company closed down or moved	Slack work	Position or shift abolished
TOTAL					
Total, 20 years and over	5,091	100.0	49.0	38.7	12.4
20 to 24 years	342	100.0	47.1	47.1	5.8
25 to 54 years	3,809	100.0	46.3	41.0	12.7
55 to 64 years	748	100.0	57.8	28.2	14.0
65 years and over	191	100.0	70.8	18.1	11.1
Men					
Total, 20 years and over	3,328	100.0	46.0	42.9	11.1
20 to 24 years	204	100.0	39.5	59.6	.9
25 to 54 years	2,570	100.0	43.9	44.8	11.3
55 to 64 years	461	100.0	55.6	30.5	14.0
65 years and over	92	100.0	68.7	15.7	15.5
Women					
Total, 20 years and over	1,763	100.0	54.6	30.8	14.6
20 to 24 years	138	100.0	58.3	28.7	12.9
25 to 54 years	1,239	100.0	51.1	33.3	15.6
55 to 64 years	287	100.0	61.4	24.5	14.1
65 years and over	99	100.0	72.8	20.3	6.9
WHITE					
Total, 20 years and over	4,397	100.0	49.6	37.9	12.5
Men	2,913	100.0	46.0	42.6	11.4
Women	1,484	100.0	56.7	28.7	14.6
BLACK					
Total, 20 years and over	602	100.0	43.8	44.7	11.6
Men	358	100.0	44.9	46.4	8.8
Women	244	100.0	42.2	42.2	15.7
HISPANIC ORIGIN					
Total, 20 years and over	282	100.0	47.4	45.2	7.3
Men	189	100.0	48.1	43.8	8.1
Women	93	100.0	46.2	48.1	5.7

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table 5. Workers who were displaced from jobs between January 1979 and January 1984 by age, sex, race, Hispanic origin, and tenure when job ended

(Percent)

Age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin	Total1/ (thousands)	Total	3 to 4 years	5 to 9 years	10 to 14 years	15 to 19 years	20 or more years	Median years on lost job
TOTAL								
Total, 20 years and over	5,091	100.0	36.2	33.8	14.7	6.7	8.8	6.1
25 years and over	4,748	100.0	33.5	34.5	15.5	7.1	9.4	6.5
25 to 54 years	3,809	100.0	37.9	35.9	14.5	5.0	6.7	5.8
55 to 64 years	748	100.0	15.5	23.2	21.2	12.2	27.9	12.4
65 years and over	191	100.0	14.8	31.1	12.3	11.9	30.0	11.9
Men								
Total, 20 years and over	3,328	100.0	34.6	31.6	15.8	7.4	10.6	6.6
25 years and over	3,123	100.0	31.8	32.6	16.5	7.8	11.3	7.0
25 to 54 years	2,570	100.0	35.8	35.2	16.2	8.7	4.1	6.2
55 to 64 years	461	100.0	12.9	19.5	19.0	13.0	35.5	14.4
65 years and over	92	100.0	14.3	25.0	12.1	12.8	35.8	14.3
Women								
Total, 20 years and over	1,763	100.0	39.4	37.4	12.6	5.3	5.3	5.7
25 years and over	1,625	100.0	36.7	38.2	13.6	5.8	5.7	5.9
25 to 54 years	1,239	100.0	42.4	40.4	11.1	4.2	1.9	5.5
55 to 64 years	287	100.0	19.7	29.1	24.7	11.0	15.5	10.2
65 years and over	99	100.0	18.9	30.9	12.5	11.0	26.7	9.8
WHITE								
Total, 20 years and over	4,397	100.0	36.3	33.5	14.8	6.5	8.9	6.1
Men	2,913	100.0	34.6	31.8	15.8	7.2	10.6	6.5
Women	1,484	100.0	39.3	38.9	12.9	5.2	3.7	5.7
BLACK								
Total, 20 years and over	602	100.0	36.6	34.4	14.0	7.2	7.8	6.1
Men	358	100.0	33.8	30.2	16.8	8.2	10.9	7.0
Women	244	100.0	40.7	40.4	9.8	5.8	3.3	5.5
HISPANIC ORIGIN								
Total, 20 years and over	282	100.0	37.9	32.4	13.9	6.2	9.7	5.9
Men	189	100.0	32.6	30.5	18.7	7.0	11.2	7.0
Women	93	100.0	48.5	36.4	4.0	4.3	6.7	5.1

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table 4. Employment status of displaced workers by industry and class of worker of lost job, January 1984

(Percent)

Industry and class of worker of lost job	Total 1/ (thousands)	Total	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the labor force
Total, 20 years and over 2/	5,091	100.0	60.1	25.5	14.4
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	4,700	100.0	59.8	25.8	14.4
Mining	150	100.0	60.4	31.0	8.6
Construction	401	100.0	55.0	30.7	14.3
Manufacturing	2,483	100.0	58.5	27.4	14.1
Durable goods	1,675	100.0	58.2	28.9	12.9
Lumber and wood products	81	100.0	67.9	19.1	13.0
Furniture and fixtures	65	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Stone, clay, and glass products	75	100.0	47.5	30.5	22.0
Primary metal industries	219	100.0	45.7	38.7	15.6
Fabricated metal products	173	100.0	62.0	32.2	5.8
Machinery, except electrical	388	100.0	62.3	27.4	10.3
Electrical machinery	109	100.0	48.2	34.5	17.3
Transportation equipment	354	100.0	62.6	26.0	11.4
Automobiles	224	100.0	62.9	24.0	13.1
Other transportation equipment	130	100.0	62.1	29.4	8.5
Professional and photographic equipment	56	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Other durable goods industries	62	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Nondurable goods	808	100.0	59.1	24.2	16.7
Food and kindred products	175	100.0	52.5	32.5	15.0
Textile mill products	88	100.0	59.8	26.2	13.9
Apparel and other finished textile products	132	100.0	63.0	14.2	22.8
Paper and allied products	60	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Printing and publishing	103	100.0	58.0	22.9	19.1
Chemical and allied products	110	100.0	64.0	27.3	8.7
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	100	100.0	62.8	18.3	18.9
Other nondurable goods industries	69	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Transportation and public utilities	336	100.0	57.9	28.8	13.3
Transportation	280	100.0	58.8	30.5	10.7
Communication and other public utilities	56	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Wholesale and retail trade	732	100.0	61.4	21.8	16.9
Wholesale trade	234	100.0	69.6	22.0	8.4
Retail trade	498	100.0	57.6	21.5	20.9
Finance, insurance, and real estate	93	100.0	78.5	12.4	9.1
Services	506	100.0	65.0	20.5	14.5
Professional services	187	100.0	64.0	19.8	16.1
Other service industries	319	100.0	65.6	20.9	13.5
Agricultural wage and salary workers	108	100.0	69.9	22.9	7.2
Government workers	268	100.0	63.3	18.7	18.0
Self-employed and unpaid family workers	25	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

2/ Total includes a small number who did not report industry or class of worker.

3/ Data not shown where base is less than 75,000.

Table 5. Employment status of displaced workers by occupation of lost job, January 1984

(Percent)

Occupation of lost job	Total 1/ (thousands)	Total	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the labor force
Total, 20 years and over 2/	5,091	100.0	60.1	25.5	14.4
Managerial and professional specialty	703	100.0	74.7	16.6	8.8
Executive, administrative, and managerial	444	100.0	75.7	15.6	8.7
Professional specialty	260	100.0	72.9	18.2	8.9
Technical, sales, and administrative support	1,162	100.0	60.6	21.1	18.3
Technicians and related support	122	100.0	67.9	25.3	6.8
Sales occupations	468	100.0	66.7	14.6	18.7
Administrative support, including clerical	572	100.0	54.1	25.5	20.5
Service occupations	275	100.0	51.0	24.1	24.9
Protective service	32	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Service, except private household and protective	243	100.0	53.0	23.6	23.4
Precision production, craft and repair	1,042	100.0	61.6	26.1	12.3
Mechanics and repairers	261	100.0	61.3	29.3	9.4
Construction trades	315	100.0	63.2	23.8	13.0
Other precision production, craft, and repair	467	100.0	60.8	25.8	13.4
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	1,823	100.0	54.6	31.6	13.7
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	1,144	100.0	56.0	27.5	16.5
Transportation and material moving occupations	324	100.0	63.8	28.7	7.5
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	355	100.0	41.8	47.6	10.6
Construction laborers	55	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	300	100.0	42.0	47.0	11.0
Farming, forestry, and fishing	68	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

2/ Total includes a small number who did not report occupation.

3/ Data not shown where base is less than 75,000.

Table 6. Employment status and area of residence in January 1984 of displaced workers by selected characteristics

(Numbers in thousands)

Characteristic	Total[1]	New England	Middle Atlantic	East North Central	West North Central	South Atlantic	East South Central	West South Central	Mountain	Pacific
WORKERS WHO LOST JOBS										
Total	5,091	260	794	1,206	428	664	379	484	211	667
Men	3,328	155	530	772	282	428	236	347	152	427
Women	1,763	105	264	434	145	236	143	137	59	241
REASON FOR JOB LOSS										
Plant or company closed down or moved	2,492	118	410	556	208	339	204	231	103	321
Slack work	1,970	126	269	513	164	236	132	211	83	236
Position or shift abolished	629	16	115	138	56	89	42	42	26	88
INDUSTRY OF LOST JOB										
Construction	481	18	68	88	36	81	34	63	30	63
Manufacturing	2,514	158	414	658	210	298	189	215	58	315
Durable goods	1,686	94	260	514	137	175	107	142	40	218
Nondurable goods	828	64	154	145	73	122	82	73	18	97
Transportation and public utilities	352	14	61	83	34	34	33	41	18	32
Wholesale and retail trade	740	41	100	182	68	132	60	54	32	80
Finance and service industries	648	22	122	133	45	70	32	54	39	132
Public administration	84	2	10	22	5	13	4	8	3	18
Other industries[2]	272	5	20	40	28	38	45	49	23	19
EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN JANUARY 1984										
Employed	3,058	171	428	621	278	461	209	344	148	399
Unemployed	1,299	48	225	402	96	117	113	85	33	181
Percent less than 5 weeks	22.1	(3)	24.1	21.3	13.0	29.4	17.3	25.4	(3)	18.4
Percent 27 weeks or more	38.8	(3)	36.9	47.2	47.5	25.3	31.7	28.8	(3)	29.0
Not in the labor force	733	41	141	185	54	85	56	55	30	86

---

[1] Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

[2] Includes a small number who did not report industry.

[3] Data not shown where base is less than 75,000.

NOTE: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont compose the New England Division; New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania compose the Middle Atlantic Division; Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin compose the East North Central Division; Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota compose the West North Central Division; Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia compose the South Atlantic Division; Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee compose the East South Central Division; Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas compose the West South Central Division; Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming compose the Mountain Division; Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington compose the Pacific Division.

Table 7. Characteristics of new job of displaced workers who lost full-time wage and salary jobs and were reemployed in January 1984 by industry of lost job

(In thousands)

Industry of lost job	Total reemployed January 1984	Part-time job	Full-time wage and salary job: Total 1/	Earnings relative to those of lost job: 20 percent or more below	Below, but within 20 percent	Equal or above, but within 20 percent	20 percent or more above	Self-employment or other full-time job
Total who lost full-time wage and salary jobs 2/	2,841	357	2,266	621	320	571	533	218
Construction	253	26	199	48	30	47	61	28
Manufacturing	1,418	151	1,200	366	171	286	247	67
Durable goods	956	106	797	281	102	181	155	51
Primary metal industries	98	14	77	40	5	22	5	7
Steel 3/	78	14	59	33	1	16	5	4
Other primary metals	20	-	18	7	2	9	-	2
Fabricated metal products	102	12	81	30	6	21	16	9
Machinery, except electrical	244	17	215	77	34	39	40	12
Electrical machinery	94	10	84	26	12	14	27	-
Transportation equipment	219	30	174	66	22	42	34	14
Automobiles	141	19	115	43	16	21	26	7
Other transportation equipment	77	11	59	23	6	21	8	7
Nondurable goods	464	45	403	85	69	105	92	16
Transportation and public utilities	191	15	154	40	22	44	27	22
Wholesale and retail trade	399	72	296	61	41	79	85	31
Finance and service industries	378	58	270	59	35	81	74	50
Public administration	48	4	42	11	5	7	18	2
Other industries 4/	153	31	104	36	16	24	22	18

1/ Includes 221,000 persons who did not report earnings on lost job.

2/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a full-time wage and salary job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or their positions or shifts were abolished.

3/ Includes blast furnaces, steelworks, rolling and finishing mills, and iron and steel foundries.

4/ Includes a small number who did not report industry.

Senator **Proxmire**. Now, the initial report contained much valuable information by demographic, industrial, and geographic characteristics of displaced workers. Other parts of the survey raised its policy issues as whether displaced workers tend to exhaust unemployment insurance, whether they lose health benefits or regain them if they find a new job, whether they move, and whether job market prospects are any different if workers receive advanced notice of a plant shutdown. Can you discuss those questions?

Ms. **Norwood**. I would like to point out that that survey was a one-time supplement to the Current Population Survey which I'm very pleased to say was supported with financing from the Department of Labor. We will be having a detailed article shortly which will get at some of the detailed data that were collected and we are making the data available for researchers who want to look at many of those issues themselves. We will furnish you with copies of our reports as they become available.

Senator **Proxmire**. Now, you report that, altogether, manufacturing industries regained only 70 percent of the jobs lost during the recession. And the jobs in this sector did not go up appreciably during November and December. Industries like steel have barely grown at all since the trough of the recession while textiles, chemicals, and machinery expanded very slowly. A few industries like mining, petroleum, and leather products are still losing jobs.

Within the manufacturing sector what distinguishes the losers and slow growers from the gainers?

Ms. **Norwood**. Well, I think that there are several things. If we start with the nondurable industries, we have had industries that have been in decline for many years—textiles, apparel, leather, for example.

Those clearly have been having difficulty partly in terms of technology, partly in terms of various kinds of competition, both from imports and, may I say, from other kinds of fabrics, as well from some reductions in consumers' purchases, which we seem to be finding in our consumer expenditure survey data.

Then there is tobacco, which has particular problems. There is some considerable publicity about the effects of smoking, and so on, which is affecting sales of tobacco products.

In durable manufacturing, steel, primary metals, in general, are having difficulty. That's the most negative one, I think, but machinery, generally, and fabricated metals are also having some considerable difficulty, although fabricated metals did well this month.

Oil and gas extraction industries, in mining and some of the petroleum-related manufacturing industries, are also not recovering as fast. They were slower going down. They're slower coming back. Part of that is related to the supply of energy, to a lot of the changes that have gone on in the use of energy.

In manufacturing there is a lot of improvement that has been going on for a long time in manufacturing industries that are related to housing. Housing has done fairly well and that means that furniture manufacturing has done well, as have some of the appliance manufacturing groups.

And then the automobile industry, which clearly is not back to the levels of employment that it had in, say, 1979, nevertheless, has fully recovered employment losses from the 1981-82 recession and has, in fact, regained much more, about one and a half times the number of jobs that were lost.

Senator PROXMIRE. Now, does technological change tend to restrain the growth of an industry's employment? Robotics, computers, technological change that replaces the workers with more efficient equipment? Reduces the number necessary?

Ms. NORWOOD. There are those who believe that it does. Generally speaking, however, industries that invest in new technology are usually industries that are expanding. And so it's a question of displacement of workers who have not yet been hired.

I think it depends on the particular situation but I believe that the use of new technology does not necessarily mean a reduction.

Senator PROXMIRE. How about the presence or absence of trade restraints?

Ms. NORWOOD. That's a whole other area, Senator Proxmire. And that can be looked at in many different ways. I don't really have anything to add to the discussion that's been——

Senator PROXMIRE. I just have two more quick questions. The first is, the late Arthur Okun, as you remember, said that in order to reduce unemployment by 1 percent, real GNP had to increase by 3 percent. Does Okun's law still hold, and how would you modify it?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think Arthur Okun made an enormous contribution to economic literature. There have been some shifts in the economy. There have been very important shifts in the composition of the labor force since Okun's law was established.

And I would expect that, and I believe that most economists think, that one needs to look at those issues in greater detail. I have no particular law to suggest. I think one ought to look at Art Okun's work and also ought to look at the shifts that have occurred in the economy.

I don't think you can apply that law to the conditions of today without careful analysis.

Senator PROXMIRE. My final question, and you may want to refer to the distinguished Mr. Dalton, who is an expert in inflation, among others, the November Price Index for finished goods climbed 0.5 percent, the biggest increase in 11 months. Consumer food prices in this index rose 0.7 percent, other goods, 0.4 percent.

Are there other signs that inflation is heating up?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I would just say no and ask Mr. Dalton to go on.

Mr. DALTON. I would agree. [Laughter.]

I think, in particular, consumer finished foods shot up in November. But we didn't see that come through in the CPI in the same month.

Senator PROXMIRE. But doesn't that follow? Doesn't the Producer Price Index—isn't that a forerunner of what's likely to happen in ensuing months?

Mr. DALTON. Typically, it is, particularly in the food area. And the fact that it didn't come through——

Senator PROXMIRE. And CPI should rise in January or February perhaps?

Mr. DALTON. Perhaps; December.

Ms. **Norwood**. But I think the point is that the fact that it didn't come through may mean that is was a very short-lived kind of development. So we can't really read too much into that until we see.

In any case, as you know, food prices bounce up and down all through the year.

Senator **Proxmire**. At any rate, you and your experts don't feel that there's much evidence that we're on the verge of suffering the resumption of inflation?

Ms. **Norwood**. No, sir. We think that prices seem to be behaving themselves fairly——

Senator **Proxmire**. You think what?

Ms. **Norwood**. Prices seem to be behaving themselves fairly well.

Senator **Abdnor**. Thank you, Senator Proxmire. This could go on for a long time, I'm enjoying it very much, but, for one, I have to dash off to another meeting.

We have certainly appreciated your testimony and questions and answers today. Thank you very much, Ms. Norwood, Mr. Dalton, and Mr. Plewes for coming up before us. We look forward to seeing you next month. I hope the news stays encouraging and looks better than ever.

Thank you very much.

Ms. **Norwood**. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 10:52 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1985

Congress of the United States,
Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2203, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. David R. Obey (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representative Obey and Senator Proxmire.

Also present: Richard Kaufman, general counsel; and William R. Buechner and Christopher J. Frenze, professional staff members.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE OBEY, CHAIRMAN

Representative Obey. If we can get started on time, I want to welcome Janet Norwood for our monthly discussion of the unemployment figures, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Ms. Norwood, I'm frankly surprised by the numbers this morning. I guess the consensus has been that we would continue to see declines in unemployment. I'm not sure how significant these numbers are, but I am surprised. You report that the civilian unemployment rate rose from 7.2 to 7.4 percent, and that employment obviously didn't grow enough to absorb new entrants into the job market. I am surprised, and I hope it's just a temporary blip on the chart. Frankly, my personal concern, much more than these individual monthly movements, is simply the fact that we're some 25 to 26 months into the recovery, and in historical terms, we're still at a very high level of unemployment overall.

And when you consider those who are underemployed, who are statistically not counted, you still have a hell of a lot of people—being blunt about it—who are in trouble.

As I understand it, since 1948, the civilian unemployment rate has exceeded the present figure of 7.4 percent, in only 72 months out of the 445 months that we've had since 1948, and 45 of those exceptions occurred during the recessions of 1980 to 1982. To me that indicates some historical, long-term progressions that are discomforting to a lot of people, if not everybody in this room, who has a job this morning.

I think also that members of the committee have pointed out on numerous occasions that there are major groups in this society and in our work force who are still in trouble. Black unemployment is still 14.9 percent in January and the gaps between the blacks and whites which normally shrink have, in most instances, not done so.

Underemployment remains severe. It certainly remains severe in a district like mine. Five million six hundred thousand people who wanted full-time work had to settle for part-time jobs. Neither those involuntary part-time workers nor the 1.3 million discouraged workers, who've given up looking for work because they think that nothing's available, are counted. And my understanding is that if both groups were included, according to BLS calculations, the overall unemployment rate last quarter would have been 10.8 percent. That's not a political statement. It would occur regardless of whose name is on the White House door. It's simply a historical fact which we have to deal with, and which I hope that the committee will be focusing on in the next 2 years.

With that short preliminary statement, let me simply welcome you, and before I ask you to give us your statement, I simply want to express my apologies for not being at the celebration that was held earlier in the week, commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Your agency does an outstanding job of gathering information and disseminating that information. Billions of dollars move around in this economy and this Congress, on the basis of numbers produced by your shop. I think all of us, regardless of political persuasion, have to be extremely attentive to the need to protect the quality of that data base and to protect the ability of Congress and other people in this economy who use information produced by you, to receive that information clearly and quickly and to make the best possible use of it for the good of the country.

I hope Congress and the administration will be doing everything possible to protect and strengthen that data base during the coming 2 years.

With that, let me welcome you here, Commissioner.

Ms. **NORWOOD**. Thank you very much.

Representative **OBEY**. Good morning, Senator Proxmire.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Senator **PROXMIRE**. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

May I just say something. I'd like to, because we're very proud and happy to have the chairman, and Wisconsin has had a habit of being chairman of this Joint Economic Committee.

Henry Reuss was chairman; I was chairman. And I must say, one of our brightest claims in Wisconsin, of course, is that we have the great La Follette tradition. Young Bob La Follette was on this committee when it first started out. I didn't know that until Dave called it to my attention. I thought he was wrong. But he turned out to be right, as he usually is.

Well, if you thought that Reuss and Proxmire were classy, you haven't seen anything yet. [Laughter.]

This guy is really good. He's sharp. He's much younger than we were when we took over. And I'm sure he'll have all kinds of energy and intelligence, and he'll make this committee sparkle. There's no committee, I think, that has greater potential than the Joint Economic Committee, but it depends a great deal on the chairman's kind of initiative, ability, and energy, and he certainly has that.

The figures this morning are very interesting, because we've just had what the President properly hailed as the best year, in many ways, economically, that we'd had in a long time. Best growth years, in the 33 years, 1984 was; 1984 was also a year of stable prices. That's a terrific combination, and it was a year of encouraging developments in lots of ways. But in the employment area, it was not a very good year. We didn't have much improvement, really, since May, and the figures this morning take us right back to May, as far as the averages are concerned, and the actual number of Americans who are actually out of work is over 9 million, an astonishing fact, it seems to me. I know January's a bad month, but something like 9.1 million, and we have to correct it for seasonal factors. It comes down to 8½ million, but that's still a very unfortunate situation.

Now the Wall Street Journal this morning in its economic column, started off the following:

> Factory orders for manufactured goods fell 0.7 percent in December. The Government's Index of Leading Indicators declined 0.2 percent. Home sales during the month rose a smaller than expected 3.1 percent. Reports have raised questions about the current strength of the economy.

The general economic consensus is that we're going to have a very good year, but certainly we're starting off with some very disquieting and disturbing figures, and I'm anxious to hear your analysis of the significance of the 0.2 increase in January.

Representative OBEY. Ms. Norwood, please proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY THOMAS J. PLEWES, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Ms. NORWOOD. Thank you very much. We look forward to a very challenging period of time in discussing these data with the Joint Economic Committee.

In January, after seasonal adjustment, the labor force rose and the level of joblessness increased. Both the overall unemployment rate at 7.3 percent, and the civilian worker rate, at 7.4, were 0.2 of a percentage point higher than in December. Although total employment, as measured by the household survey changed little between December and January, payroll jobs, as reported in the business survey, rose by 350,000 after seasonal adjustment.

Winter weather in January generally curtails construction activities, and retail trade and other service industries usually cut back employment from expanded December holiday levels. This year there were smaller than usual declines in construction, retail trade, and services. In part, this was because the survey week was a bit earlier than usual, the 6th to the 12th of January, and the weather was comparatively mild.

After seasonable adjustment, these three industries showed significant job gains from December to January. Indeed, all three have had strong job growth over the year. Construction has grown by 345,000, retail trade by 835,000, and services have increased by 965,000.

There was little change in the factory job count in January, following a relatively large increase in the previous month. Within manufacturing, January employment increases were limited to electrical and electronic equipment, transportation equipment—mostly automobiles—and printing and publishing.

At 19.8 million, the number of jobs in manufacturing was up by nearly 600,000 from a year earlier, but most of that increase took place before last summer. In fact, manufacturing has not yet regained all of the jobs lost during the recession. Some industries, such as transportation equipment, lumber, furniture, and rubber and plastics, have expanded their employment considerably during the recovery; indeed, the January job level in the electrical equipment industry was at an all-time high. Other industries—steel, textiles, leather, and petroleum and coal products—have shown no job gains at all, even after 26 months of recovery.

The factory workweek edged down a 10th of an hour from the relatively high levels that have been prevailing. With the decline in hours and little change in employment, the index of aggregate factory hours fell by 0.2 of a percentage point. At 96.6, with 1977 as a 100 base, the index, nevertheless, remained 1.8 percent above its level of a year ago.

The civilian labor force advanced by 400,000 in January, after seasonal adjustment. Over the past year, the labor force has risen by nearly 2.5 million, with adult women accounting for 70 percent of that gain. Typically, the female labor force declines from December to January. This year, however, their number held steady and after seasonal adjustment, the labor force participation rate for adult women rose to 54.4 percent. The January jobless rate for women 20 years and over also rose—to 6.8 percent.

This increase in unemployment took place among persons newly unemployed, those jobless for 5 weeks or less. In contrast, the number of persons unemployed for 6 months or more dropped to 1.3 million in January, after having remained at the 1.4 million mark from October to December. As a result of these movements, the median duration of unemployment declined from 7.4 to 6.7 weeks.

What are we to conclude from the statistics released this morning? The business survey shows continued strength in the economy but very little job growth in the manufacturing industry. The employment gains in January were not large enough to absorb an increase in the labor force, however, and unemployment, therefore, rose.

Now I've added to my statement, Mr. Chairman, a short summary of some changes that have been introduced to improve the current population survey as a part of our overall redesign program that will be completed in July of this year. Most of this involves some technical changes in estimating procedure which had no effect on the December to January change. We did calculate the data in several ways, and we are certain of that.

One element that I think is important to point out is the fact that we have improved the data for the Hispanic population of the country. Because the 1980 census took special care in identifying the Hispanic population, we have been able to develop separate estimates of the Hispanic population which had not been possible to do before. These estimates are being used as population controls to differentiate the Hispanic group from the rest of the population in the survey estimation process.

As you know, this survey covers 60,000 households, and then the estimation procedures expand those data to represent the total population and in that process now, we are able to control for the size of the Hispanic population, which we were not able to do before.

Those procedures affect the level of employment and unemployment for the Hispanic population, but they do not affect the ratios, for example, the unemployment rate. And what we have done is to calculate those data on the new basis all the way back to 1980, so that they would be available for anyone who wants to see them.

I just wanted to call that to your attention. I think it's the kind of improvement that we should be making as a statistical agency. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Norwood, together with the Employment Situation press release, follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am pleased to have this opportunity to offer the Joint Economic Committee a few comments to supplement our Employment Situation press release issued this morning.

In January, after seasonal adjustment, the labor force rose, and the level of joblessness increased. Both the overall unemployment rate, at 7.3 percent, and the civilian worker rate, at 7.4 percent, were 0.2 of a percentage point higher than in December. Although total employment, as measured by the household survey, changed little between December and January, payroll jobs, as reported in the business survey, rose by 350,000 after seasonal adjustment.

Winter weather in January generally curtails construction activities, and retail trade and other service industries usually cut back employment from expanded December holiday levels. This year, there were smaller than usual declines in construction, retail trade, and services, in part because the survey week was earlier than usual (January 6-12), and the weather was comparatively mild.

After seasonal adjustment, these three industries showed significant job gains from December to January. Indeed, all three have had strong job growth over the year: Construction has grown by 345,000, retail trade by 835,000, and services has increased by 965,000.

There was little change in the factory job count in January, following a relatively large increase in the previous month. Within manufacturing, January employment increases were limited to electrical and electronic equipment, transportation equipment--mostly in automobiles--and printing and publishing. At 19.8 million, the number of jobs in manufacturing was up by nearly 600,000 from a year earlier, but most of that increase took place before last summer. In fact, manufacturing has not yet regained all of the jobs lost during the recession. Some industries, such as transportation equipment, lumber, furniture, and rubber and plastics, have expanded their employment considerably during the recovery; indeed, the January job level in the electrical equipment industry was at an all-time high. Other industries--steel, textiles, leather, and petroleum and coal products--have shown no job gains at all even after 26 months of recovery.

The factory workweek edged down a tenth of an hour from the relatively high levels that have been prevailing. With the decline in hours and little change in employment, the index of aggregate factory hours fell by 0.2 percentage point. At 96.6 (1977=100), the index, nevertheless, remained 1.8 percent above its level of a year ago.

The civilian labor force advanced by 400,000 in January (after seasonal adjustment). Over the past year, the labor force has risen by nearly 2.5 million, with adult women accounting for 70 percent of the gain. Typically, the female labor force declines from December to January. This year, however, their number held steady, and, after seasonal adjustment, the labor force participation rate for adult women rose to 54.4 percent. The January jobless rate for women 20 years and over also rose--to 6.8 percent.

This increase in unemployment took place among persons newly unemployed--those jobless for 5 weeks or less. In contrast, the number of persons unemployed for 6 months or more dropped to 1.3 million in January, after having remained at the 1.4-million mark from October to December. As a result of these movements, the median duration of unemployment declined from 7.4 to 6.7 weeks.

What are we to conclude from the statistics released this morning? The business survey shows continued strength in the economy, but very little job growth in the manufacturing industry. The employment gains in January were not large enough to absorb an increase in the labor force, however, and unemployment, therefore, rose.

Improvements in Household Survey Estimation

As you know, the Current Population Survey is being revised to take account of the changes recorded in the 1980 Census and to make other improvements. These improvements are being gradually phased into the survey. In January, new statistical techniques were introduced in the estimating process. The Bureau will publish a technical note describing the new techniques in detail in February. These improved statistical techniques did not significantly affect the December-January changes in the estimates reported this morning.

In one case, however, involving data for the Hispanic population, the improvement had a significant effect, and we have recalculated these data back to 1980. The fact that considerable improvements were made in the data collection on Hispanics in the 1980 Census made possible the development of separate estimates of the Hispanic population. These estimates are being used as "population controls" to differentiate the Hispanic group from the rest of the population in the survey estimation process. Labor force data are collected from a sample of 60,000 households throughout the country, and these data are then adjusted to represent the entire population. This new process has raised the level of both employment and unemployment for Hispanics, but their unemployment rate was little changed. Data for Hispanics revised back to 1980 will appear in the February 1985 issue of Employment and Earnings.

My colleagues and I would be glad to answer any questions the Committee may have.

Unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods

Month and year	Unadjusted rate	X-11 ARIMA method: Official procedure	X-11 ARIMA method: Concurrent (as first computed)	X-11 ARIMA method: Concurrent (revised)	X-11 ARIMA method: Stable	X-11 ARIMA method: Total	X-11 ARIMA method: Residual	X-11 method (official method before 1980)	Range (cols. 2-8)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1984									
January......	8.8	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.0	.1
February.....	8.4	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	-
March........	8.1	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.8	.1
April........	7.6	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.9	7.8	7.7	7.8	.2
May..........	7.2	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.5	7.8	7.5	.3
June.........	7.4	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.2	.1
July.........	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.5	7.5	7.5	.1
August.......	7.3	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.5	7.5	7.5	.1
September....	7.1	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	-
October......	7.0	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.3	.1
November.....	6.9	7.1	7.1	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.1	.1
December.....	7.0	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.2	7.1	7.1	.2
1985									
January......	8.0	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.4	7.2	7.4	.2

SOURCE: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Bureau of Labor Statistics
February 1985

(1) *Unadjusted rate*. Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) *Official procedure (X-11 ARIMA method)*. The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components—agricultural employment, nonagricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 age-sex groups—males and females, ages 16-19 and 20 years and over—are seasonally adjusted independently using data from January 1974 forward. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using ARIMA (Auto-Regressive, Integrated, Moving Average) models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then seasonally adjusted with the X-11 portion of the X-11 ARIMA program. The 4 teenage unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the multiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating that total as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted series are revised at the end of each year. Extrapolated factors for January-June are computed at the beginning of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become available. Each set of 6-month factors are published in advance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of *Employment and Earnings*.

(3) *Concurrent (as first computed, X-11 ARIMA method)*. The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is seasonally adjusted with the X-11 ARIMA program each month as the most recent data become available. Rates for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) *Concurrent (revised, X-11 ARIMA method)*. The procedure used is identical to (3) above, and the rate for the current month (the last month displayed) will always be the same in the two columns. However, all previous months are subject to revision each month based on the seasonal adjustment of all the components with data through the current month.

(5) *Stable (X-11 ARIMA method)*. Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using ARIMA models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year-to-year and computes final seasonal factors as unweighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure, factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series are revised at the end of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical to the official procedure.

(6) *Total (X-11 ARIMA method)*. This is one alternative aggregation procedure, in which total unemployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with ARIMA models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X-11 part of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unemployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) *Residual (X-11 ARIMA method)*. This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using ARIMA models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted unemployment level is derived by subtracting seasonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(8) *X-11 method (official method before 1980)*. The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with ARIMA models and the factors are projected in 12-month intervals. The standard X-11 program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

Methods of Adjustment: The X-11 ARIMA method was developed at Statistics Canada by the Seasonal Adjustment and Times Series Staff under the direction of Estela Bee Dagum. The method is described in *The X-11 ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method*, by Estela Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 12-564E, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in *X-11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program*, by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young and John Musgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).

News

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1371
523-1944
523-1959
Media contact: 523-1913

USDL 85-30

TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS
RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL
8:30 A.M. (EST), FRIDAY,
FEBRUARY 1, 1985

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: JANUARY 1985

Unemployment rose in January, while the number of nonfarm payroll jobs also rose, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. The overall unemployment rate increased from 7.1 to 7.3 percent, and the rate for civilian workers moved up from 7.2 to 7.4 percent.

The number of nonagricultural payroll jobs--as measured by the monthly survey of establishments--advanced by 350,000, seasonally adjusted, to 94.8 million. Civilian employment--as measured by the monthly survey of households--was little changed, after seasonal adjustment, at 106.4 million. Despite these over-the-month differences, each series shows employment growth of 7.3 million over the course of the recovery.

Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

The civilian worker unemployment rate increased by 0.2 percentage point to 7.4 percent in January. The number of unemployed persons rose by about 300,000, after seasonal adjustment, to 8.5 million; most of this increase occurred among adult women. (See table A-2.)

The unemployment rate for adult women rose from 6.4 to 6.8 percent in January; it had averaged 6.6 percent during the fourth quarter of 1984. Jobless rates for adult men (6.3 percent) and teenagers (18.9 percent) were

> **Changes in Household Data Series**
>
> Effective with data for January 1985, improvements have been introduced into the estimation procedures used in the Current Population Survey, in conjunction with the current redesign of the survey sample. These improvements include a revision in the data for Hispanics back to January 1980. A description of the nature and impact of these changes will appear in the February 1985 issue of *Employment and Earnings*.
>
> This release also introduces new seasonally adjusted series on persons at work on involuntary part-time schedules and modifications in the age coverage of data on the Vietnam-era veteran population.

BLS
Centennial
of Labor
Statistics

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

unchanged from December. The unemployment rate for whites rose from 6.2 to 6.4 percent, while rates for blacks (14.9 percent) and Hispanics (10.6 percent) were about unchanged over the month. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

Short-term (less than 5 weeks) unemployment, at 3.7 million in January, increased substantially over the month, while long-term (15 weeks and over)

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

Category	Quarterly averages		Monthly data			Dec.-Jan. change
	1984		1984		1985	
	III	IV	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	
HOUSEHOLD DATA	Thousands of persons					
Labor force 1/	115,464	115,885	115,773	116,162	116,572	410
Total employment 1/	107,016	107,652	107,631	107,971	108,088	117
Civilian labor force	113,754	114,185	114,074	114,464	114,875	411
Civilian employment	105,306	105,951	105,932	106,273	106,391	118
Unemployment	8,447	8,233	8,142	8,191	8,484	293
Not in labor force	62,841	62,968	63,061	62,842	62,509	-333
Discouraged workers	1,211	1,303	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Percent of labor force					
Unemployment rates:						
All workers 1/	7.3	7.1	7.0	7.1	7.3	0.2
All civilian workers	7.4	7.2	7.1	7.2	7.4	0.2
Adult men	6.4	6.2	6.2	6.3	6.3	0
Adult women	6.8	6.6	6.5	6.4	6.8	0.4
Teenagers	18.6	18.4	17.8	18.8	18.9	0.1
White	6.4	6.2	6.1	6.2	6.4	0.2
Black	15.8	15.1	15.1	15.0	14.9	-0.1
Hispanic origin 2/	10.6	10.5	10.3	10.4	10.6	0.2
ESTABLISHMENT DATA	Thousands of jobs					
Nonfarm payroll employment	94,560	95,437p	95,494	95,661p	96,009p	348p
Goods-producing	25,056	25,156p	25,123	25,265p	25,347p	82p
Service-producing	69,504	70,281p	70,371	70,396p	70,662p	266p
	Hours of work					
Average weekly hours:						
Total private nonfarm	35.3	35.2p	35.2	35.3p	35.2p	-0.1p
Manufacturing	40.5	40.5p	40.5	40.7p	40.6p	-0.1p
Manufacturing overtime	3.3	3.4p	3.4	3.4p	3.3p	-0.1p

1/ Includes the resident Armed Forces.
2/ Data for 1984 and earlier years have been revised.

N.A.=not available.
p=preliminary.

unemployment declined slightly. Both measures of the average duration of unemployment dropped sharply over the month; the mean duration fell by 2 weeks to 15.3 weeks, while median duration dropped from 7.4 to 6.7 weeks. (See table A-7.)

The total number of persons working part time for economic reasons--sometimes referred to as the partially unemployed--fell by 185,000 in January to 5.6 million. Nearly all of this decline occurred among those whose hours had been reduced because of slack work; there was little change in the number of persons who could only find part-time work. (See table A-4.)

Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Civilian employment, at 106.4 million, was about unchanged over the month after seasonal adjustment. The proportion of the civilian population with jobs (the employment-population ratio) was 60.0 percent in January, the highest level since early 1980. (See table A-2.)

The civilian labor force declined less than seasonally expected in January and, after adjustment for seasonality, increased by 410,000 to 114.9 million. Virtually all of the over-the-month increase took place among women 16 years and over. The civilian labor force participation rate increased to 64.8 percent, 0.2 percentage point above the December figure. This is the highest seasonally adjusted level ever recorded.

Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Total nonagricultural payroll employment increased by 350,000 in January to 96.0 million, after seasonal adjustment. Increases occurred in nearly three-fifths of the industries in the BLS index of diffusion. The January job count was 3.5 million above its year-earlier level. (See tables B-1 and B-6.)

The bulk of the January employment expansion occurred in the service-producing sector, paced by a 130,000 gain in retail trade. Seasonally adjusted increases were pervasive throughout this industry, as employment fell less than it usually has between December and January. This followed exceptionally strong job growth during the holiday period. Retail trade has added 1.6 million jobs since the November 1982 recession trough.

Elsewhere in the service-producing sector, job growth continued in services (65,000), with business services and health services contributing about equally to the increase. Employment in business services has risen by more than 900,000 since November 1982 and by nearly 400,000 over the past year. Two-thirds of the 30,000 over-the-month increase in wholesale trade employment occurred in the durable goods portion.

Manufacturing employment was little changed over the month. Modest gains in motor vehicles, electrical and electronic equipment, and printing and publishing were tempered by little movement or small decreases in other manufacturing industries.

Construction employment registered a gain of 70,000 after seasonal adjustment, a partial reflection of the unusually mild weather in early January. Mining employment decreased for the fourth consecutive month.

Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

The average workweek of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls edged down a tenth of an hour in January, seasonally adjusted, as did weekly and overtime hours in manufacturing. (See table B-2.)

The index of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls was unchanged over the month at 114.5 (1977=100), 3.7 percent above the year-earlier level. The manufacturing index decreased by 0.2 percent to 96.6. (See table B-5.)

Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings fell 0.4 percent in January, and weekly earnings were down 0.6 percent, seasonally adjusted. Prior to seasonal adjustment, average hourly earnings rose 3 cents to $8.49, and average weekly earnings were down $4.88 to $295.45. Over the past year, hourly earnings have risen 23 cents and weekly earnings $6.35. (See table B-3.)

The Hourly Earnings Index (Establishment Survey Data)

The Hourly Earnings Index (HEI) was 162.7 (1977=100) in January, seasonally adjusted, a decrease of 0.2 percent from December. For the 12 months ended in January, the increase (before seasonal adjustment) was 2.7 percent. The HEI excludes the effects of two types of changes unrelated to underlying wage rate movements--fluctuations in overtime in manufacturing and interindustry employment shifts. In dollars of constant purchasing power, the HEI decreased 0.2 percent during the 12-month period ended in December. (See table B-4.)

Explanatory Note

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey (household survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 60,000 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonagricultural payrolls that appears in the B tables, marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by BLS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes approximately 200,000 establishments employing over 35 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

Coverage, definitions, and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as *unemployed*, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time; and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Also included among the unemployed are persons not looking for work because they were laid off and waiting to be recalled and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days.

The *labor force* equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The *unemployment rate* is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1 and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroll records of nonagricultural firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey excludes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces;

The household survey includes persons on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not;

The household survey is limited to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age; and

The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each individual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, persons working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

Seasonal adjustment

Over the course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 90 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity.

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemployment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January–June period and again for the July–December period. The January revision is applied to data that have been published over the previous 5 years. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are calculated only once a year, along with the introduction of new benchmarks which are discussed at the end of the next section.

Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from these surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are approximately 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At approximately the 90-percent level of confidence—the confidence limits used by BLS in its analyses—the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 128,000; for total unemployment it is 220,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.19 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of teenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .26 percentage point; for teenagers, it is 1.25 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment—against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS. It is available for $4.50 per issue or $31.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M, O, P, and Q of that publication.

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status and sex	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total employed[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Agriculture	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate[4]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Not in labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total employed[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate[4]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total employed[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate[4]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[1] Includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States.

[2] Labor force as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[3] Total employment as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[4] Unemployment as a percent of the labor force including the resident Armed Forces.

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Jan. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985	Jan. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985
TOTAL									
Civilian noninstitutional population	175,533	177,306	177,384	175,533	176,763	176,956	177,135	177,306	177,384
Civilian labor force	111,025	114,028	113,475	112,322	113,766	114,016	114,074	114,464	114,875
Participation rate	63.3	64.3	64.0	64.0	64.4	64.4	64.4	64.6	64.8
Employed	101,271	106,049	104,344	103,294	105,386	105,649	105,932	106,273	106,391
Employment-population ratio[2]	57.7	59.8	58.8	58.8	59.6	59.7	59.8	59.9	60.0
Unemployed	9,754	7,979	9,131	9,028	8,380	8,367	8,142	8,191	8,484
Unemployment rate	8.8	7.0	8.0	8.0	7.4	7.3	7.1	7.2	7.4
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	75,692	76,753	76,760	75,692	76,451	76,565	76,663	76,753	76,760
Civilian labor force	58,926	59,921	59,576	59,285	59,892	59,913	59,996	60,131	60,035
Participation rate	77.8	78.1	77.6	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.2
Employed	53,985	56,090	55,183	55,012	56,075	56,184	56,260	56,372	56,234
Employment-population ratio[2]	71.3	73.1	71.9	72.7	73.3	73.4	73.4	73.4	73.3
Agriculture	2,130	2,303	2,173	2,367	2,414	2,336	2,428	2,494	2,417
Nonagricultural industries	51,855	53,787	53,010	52,645	53,661	53,848	53,833	53,878	53,817
Unemployed	4,941	3,831	4,393	4,273	3,817	3,729	3,735	3,759	3,798
Unemployment rate	8.4	6.4	7.4	7.2	6.4	6.2	6.2	6.3	6.3
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	84,860	85,995	86,013	84,860	85,600	85,793	85,897	85,995	86,013
Civilian labor force	44,883	46,633	46,623	45,031	45,956	46,266	46,270	46,463	46,771
Participation rate	52.9	54.2	54.2	53.1	53.7	53.9	53.9	54.0	54.4
Employed	41,548	43,843	43,322	41,840	42,906	43,091	43,252	43,511	43,610
Employment-population ratio[2]	49.0	51.0	50.4	49.3	50.1	50.2	50.4	50.6	50.7
Agriculture	498	513	476	621	590	569	580	595	592
Nonagricultural industries	41,050	43,330	42,846	41,219	42,316	42,522	42,672	42,916	43,018
Unemployed	3,335	2,790	3,301	3,191	3,050	3,175	3,018	2,952	3,161
Unemployment rate	7.4	6.0	7.1	7.1	6.6	6.9	6.5	6.4	6.8
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian noninstitutional population	14,981	14,557	14,610	14,981	14,624	14,598	14,575	14,557	14,610
Civilian labor force	7,216	7,474	7,277	8,006	7,928	7,839	7,801	7,870	8,072
Participation rate	48.2	51.3	49.8	53.4	54.2	53.7	53.5	54.1	55.2
Employed	5,738	6,116	5,840	6,442	6,413	6,376	6,411	6,390	6,547
Employment-population ratio[2]	38.3	42.0	40.0	43.0	43.9	43.7	44.0	43.9	44.8
Agriculture	170	197	181	306	315	266	320	296	311
Nonagricultural industries	5,568	5,919	5,659	6,136	6,098	6,110	6,091	6,094	6,236
Unemployed	1,478	1,358	1,437	1,564	1,515	1,463	1,390	1,480	1,525
Unemployment rate	20.5	18.2	19.7	19.5	19.1	18.7	17.8	18.8	18.9

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
WHITE									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
BLACK									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
HISPANIC ORIGIN									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

---

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

[3] Data for [illegible] and earlier years have been revised.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

ST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(In thousands)

Category	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
CHARACTERISTIC									
Total employed, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married men, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married women, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women who maintain families	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER									
Agriculture:									
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries:									
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PERSONS AT WORK PART TIME									
All industries:									
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries:									
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible] industrial dispute.

Table A-5. Range of unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force, seasonally adjusted

(Percent)

Measure	Quarterly averages					Monthly data		
	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]		[illegible]
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-1 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-2 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-3 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-4 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-5a Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-5b Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-6 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-7 [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

Table A-6. Selected unemployment indicators, seasonally adjusted

Category	Number of unemployed persons (In thousands)			Unemployment rates					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
CHARACTERISTIC									
Total, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married men, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married women, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women who maintain families	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Full-time workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Part-time workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force time lost [2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
INDUSTRY									
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale and retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance and service industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Government workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Agricultural wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

[2] Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force hours.

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Weeks of unemployment	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
DURATION									
Less than 5 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
5 to 14 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 to 26 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
27 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Average (mean) duration, in weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Median duration, in weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Less than 5 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
5 to 14 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 to 26 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
27 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

T COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Reason	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED									
Job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
On layoff	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Job leavers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Reentrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New entrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
On layoff	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Job leavers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Reentrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New entrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE									
Job losers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Job leavers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Reentrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
New entrants	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Table A-9. Unemployed persons by sex and age, seasonally adjusted

Sex and age	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 17 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
18 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
20 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 to 54 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
55 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 17 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
18 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
20 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 to 54 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
55 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 to 17 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
18 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
20 to 24 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
25 to 54 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
55 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

---

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

Numbers in thousands

Employment status	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Not in labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not seasonally adjusted

Numbers in thousands

Occupation	Civilian employed		Unemployed		Unemployment rate	
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total, 16 years and over[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Managerial and professional specialty	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Executive, administrative, and managerial	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Professional specialty	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Technical, sales, and administrative support	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Technicians and related support	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Sales occupations	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Administrative support, including clerical	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Service occupations	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Private household	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Protective service	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Service, except private household and protective	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Precision production, craft, and repair	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mechanics and repairers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction trades	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other precision production, craft, and repair	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and material moving occupations	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction laborers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Farming, forestry, and fishing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] Persons with no previous work experience and those whose last job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, not seasonally adjusted

Numbers in thousands

Veteran status and age	Civilian noninstitutional population		Civilian labor force							
			Total		Employed		Unemployed			
							Number		Percent of labor force	
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS										
Total, 30 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
30 to 44 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
30 to 34 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
35 to 39 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
40 to 44 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
45 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
NONVETERANS										
Total, 30 to 44 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
30 to 34 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
35 to 39 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
40 to 44 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

NOTE: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to those 30 to 44 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

Data for 25 to 29 year old veterans are no longer shown in this table because the group is rapidly disappearing into the 30-34 age category and the numbers remaining for some labor force categories are not large enough to warrant their continued publication.

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for eleven large States

(Numbers in thousands)

State and employment status	Not seasonally adjusted[1]			Seasonally adjusted[2]					
	Jan. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985	Jan. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985
California									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,861	19,137	19,161	18,861	19,058	19,086	19,111	19,137	19,161
Civilian labor force	12,278	12,653	12,761	12,327	12,614	12,823	12,609	12,635	12,815
Employed	11,153	11,779	11,738	11,295	11,592	11,880	11,686	11,734	11,886
Unemployed	1,126	874	1,023	1,032	1,022	943	923	901	930
Unemployment rate	9.2	6.9	8.0	8.4	8.1	7.4	7.3	7.1	7.3
Florida									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,510	8,676	8,691	8,510	8,628	8,644	8,660	8,676	8,691
Civilian labor force	5,211	5,196	5,237	5,088	5,113	5,104	5,121	5,170	5,311
Employed	4,842	4,879	4,895	4,730	4,803	4,783	4,823	4,868	4,981
Unemployed	369	317	342	358	310	321	298	302	330
Unemployment rate	7.1	6.1	6.5	7.0	6.1	6.3	5.8	5.8	6.2
Illinois									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,595	8,631	8,634	8,595	8,621	8,625	8,628	8,631	8,634
Civilian labor force	5,508	5,642	5,831	5,580	5,586	5,645	5,643	5,674	5,682
Employed	4,919	5,160	5,277	5,030	5,090	5,122	5,155	5,174	5,168
Unemployed	590	482	554	550	496	523	488	500	514
Unemployment rate	10.7	8.5	9.5	9.9	8.9	9.3	8.6	8.8	9.1
Massachusetts									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,495	4,542	4,544	4,495	4,527	4,532	4,536	4,540	4,544
Civilian labor force	3,058	3,067	3,019	3,028	3,058	3,049	3,058	3,061	3,037
Employed	2,887	2,947	2,882	2,838	2,922	2,931	2,928	2,930	2,932
Unemployed	171	120	138	190	136	118	130	131	105
Unemployment rate	5.6	3.9	4.6	6.3	4.4	3.9	4.3	4.3	3.5
Michigan									
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,738	6,780	6,784	6,738	6,775	6,780	6,785	6,780	6,784
Civilian labor force	4,146	4,318	4,308	4,232	4,363	4,395	4,514	4,386	4,395
Employed	3,616	3,861	3,790	3,740	3,884	3,916	3,924	3,918	3,911
Unemployed	530	457	518	492	479	479	590	468	484
Unemployment rate	12.8	10.6	12.0	11.6	11.0	10.9	13.1	10.7	11.0
New Jersey									
Civilian noninstitutional population	5,812	5,868	5,873	5,812	5,833	5,856	5,861	5,868	5,873
Civilian labor force	3,776	3,768	3,780	3,830	3,822	3,816	3,783	3,794	3,819
Employed	3,488	3,563	3,526	3,561	3,590	3,591	3,562	3,575	3,583
Unemployed	288	205	253	269	232	225	221	219	236
Unemployment rate	7.6	5.4	6.7	7.0	6.1	5.9	5.8	5.8	6.2
New York									
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,592	13,676	13,680	13,592	13,649	13,658	13,666	13,674	13,680
Civilian labor force	7,880	8,110	8,178	7,938	8,133	8,168	8,230	8,275	8,242
Employed	7,244	7,578	7,605	7,347	7,554	7,581	7,647	7,698	7,713
Unemployed	636	532	573	591	579	587	583	577	529
Unemployment rate	8.1	6.6	7.0	7.4	7.1	7.2	7.1	7.0	6.4
North Carolina									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,532	4,616	4,621	4,532	4,591	4,599	4,606	4,616	4,621
Civilian labor force	(3)	(3)	2,999	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	3,056
Employed	(3)	(3)	2,786	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	2,848
Unemployed	(3)	(3)	213	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	208
Unemployment rate	(3)	(3)	7.1	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	6.8
Ohio									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,263	8,270	8,272	8,263	8,261	8,263	8,267	8,270	8,272
Civilian labor force	4,959	5,106	5,123	5,061	5,140	5,137	5,107	5,151	5,130
Employed	4,448	4,636	4,669	4,573	4,667	4,655	4,657	4,686	4,697
Unemployed	511	470	454	488	473	482	450	465	433
Unemployment rate	10.3	9.2	8.9	9.6	9.2	9.4	8.8	9.0	8.4
Pennsylvania									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,193	9,227	9,230	9,193	9,217	9,221	9,224	9,227	9,230
Civilian labor force	5,382	5,543	5,416	5,464	5,494	5,487	5,509	5,533	5,500
Employed	4,840	5,140	4,947	4,966	4,981	5,011	5,037	5,110	5,075
Unemployed	542	403	469	498	513	476	472	423	425
Unemployment rate	10.1	7.3	8.7	9.1	9.3	8.7	8.6	7.6	7.7
Texas									
Civilian noninstitutional population	11,378	11,429	11,520	11,378	11,471	11,484	11,496	11,508	11,520
Civilian labor force	7,610	7,821	7,755	7,663	7,837	7,827	7,883	7,937	7,822
Employed	7,097	7,428	7,219	7,136	7,390	7,376	7,431	7,461	7,313
Unemployed	[illegible]	393	536	527	447	451	452	476	508
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	5.0	6.9	6.9	5.7	5.8	5.7	6.0	6.5

---

[1] These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates used in the administration of Federal fund allocation programs.

[2] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and the seasonally adjusted columns.

[3] Official estimates for North Carolina prior to 1985 are not derived from the household survey. Consequently, seasonally adjusted data are not published. The unadjusted estimates are available upon request.

Table B-1. Employees on nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(In thousands)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Jan. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984 p	Jan. 1985 p	Jan. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984 p	Jan. 1985 p
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total private	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Goods producing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Oil and gas extraction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
General building contractors	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Production workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Production workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Lumber and wood products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Furniture and fixtures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stone, clay, and glass products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Primary metal industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fabricated metal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Machinery, except electrical	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Electrical and electronic equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Motor vehicles and equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Instruments and related products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Miscellaneous manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Production workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Food and kindred products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tobacco manufactures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Textile mill products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Apparel and other textile products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Paper and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Printing and publishing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Chemicals and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Petroleum and coal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leather and leather products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Service producing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Communication and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
General merchandise stores	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Food stores	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Automotive dealers and service stations	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Eating and drinking places	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Insurance	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Business services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Health services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Government	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Federal	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
State	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Local	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

p = preliminary

r = revised

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Jan. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984 p	Jan. 1985 p	Jan. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984 p	Jan. 1985 p
Total private	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Overtime hours	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Overtime hours	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Lumber and wood products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Furniture and fixtures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stone, clay, and glass products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Primary metal industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fabricated metal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Machinery, except electrical	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Electric and electronic equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Motor vehicles and equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Instruments and related products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Miscellaneous manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Overtime hours	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Food and kindred products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tobacco manufactures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Textile mill products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Apparel and other textile products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Paper and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Printing and publishing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Chemicals and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Petroleum and coal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leather and leather products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

---

[1] Data relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; to construction workers in construction; and to nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and services. These groups account for approximately four-fifths of the total employees on private nonagricultural payrolls.

[2] This series is not published seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

p = preliminary.

Table B-3. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Average hourly earnings				Average weekly earnings			
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total private	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Seasonally adjusted	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Lumber and wood products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Furniture and fixtures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stone, clay, and glass products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Primary metal industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fabricated metal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Machinery, except electrical	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Electric and electronic equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Motor vehicles and equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Instruments and related products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Miscellaneous manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Food and kindred products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tobacco manufactures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Textile mill products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Apparel and other textile products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Paper and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Printing and publishing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Chemicals and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Petroleum and coal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leather and leather products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] See footnote 1, table A-1.

p = preliminary.

Table B-4. Hourly Earnings Index for production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

[illegible]

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted					Seasonally adjusted						
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Percent change from [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Percent change from [illegible]
Total private nonfarm:												
Current dollars	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Constant (1977) dollars	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

Table B-5. Indexes of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Jan. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984 p	Jan. 1985 p	Jan. 1984	Sept. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984 p	Jan. 1985 p
Total	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Goods-producing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Lumber and wood products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Furniture and fixtures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Stone, clay, and glass products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Primary metal industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Fabricated metal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Machinery, except electrical	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Electrical and electronic equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Motor vehicles and equipment	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Instruments and related products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Miscellaneous manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Food and kindred products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Tobacco manufactures	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Textile mill products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Apparel and other textile products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Paper and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Printing and publishing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Chemicals and allied products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Petroleum and coal products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Leather and leather products	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Service-producing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-6. Indexes of diffusion: Percent of industries in which employment[1] increased

Time span	Year	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Over 1-month span	1983	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1984	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1985	[illegible]											
Over 3-month span	1983	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1984	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1985												
Over 6-month span	1983	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1984	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]		
	1985												
Over 12-month span	1983	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	1984	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]					
	1985												

[1] Number of employees, seasonally adjusted, on 1-, 3-, 6-, and 12-month spans, on payrolls of 185 private nonagricultural industries.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Figures are the percent of industries with employment rising. (Half of the unchanged components are counted as rising.) Data are centered within the spans.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Representative OBEY. Just a couple of quick questions.

In your prepared statement, you indicate that typically the female labor force declines from December to January. This year, however, their number held steady, and after a seasonal adjustment, the labor force participation rate for adult women rose to 54.4 percent.

Do you have any conclusions from that, anything we ought to be watching for?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I think there are a couple of points that could be made. The first is that we do have to be careful not to read too much into a single month, particularly when it involves labor force change. Our experience has been that labor force change really needs to be looked at over a period of several months.

Now having said that, I think that if you look at the business survey, you will find, as I pointed out, three areas of employment gains—retail trade, construction, and services. The services industry continues to show strong growth, particularly in business services. Gains have been continuing month after month. Construction clearly was affected by the mild weather that we've had. And so there was more activity, I think, in January than there usually is.

The retail trade data are a little bit more puzzling. They would, I think, perhaps be somewhat affected by the fact that the survey week was a bit earlier and, therefore, employers may not have taken the full action that they normally do to cut back their payrolls after the Christmas period. On the other hand, there is evidence, some considerable evidence, particularly in this morning's newspaper, that retail sales from some of the major retail organizations were fairly high in January, compared to previous years, which would bear out the fact that there has been more activity in retail sales than there normally is in January.

So I think that we need to be aware of the fact that the 350,000 increase in employment reported in the business survey may, for those reasons, be slightly overstated, but I also believe that the business survey is showing real employment growth still. Except in manufacturing, which is another special case.

Representative OBEY. The same question I usually ask on this point: What proportion of the unemployed are drawing unemployment insurance?

Ms. NORWOOD. It depends on how you calculate it but if you take the number of people claiming unemployment insurance benefits as a percentage of total unemployment, the figure is 38 percent.

Now the 8.5 million unemployed in January, of course, includes the people who are new entrants to the labor force who probably wouldn't have UI coverage.

Representative OBEY. And that compares historically how?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, for many months now the proportion of the total unemployed who are claiming benefits has been quite low. Historically, it used to be in the 45, 50, or higher percent range and if you go all the way back to 1975 it was 67 percent. But for the last couple of years, but especially 1983 and 1984, it has been considerably lower.

Representative OBEY. In your judgment, why haven't we seen a decline in the number of persons who are trying to find full-time work but wind up in a part-time situation?

You would expect—at least I would expect—that normally in an economy which has been recovering for this long a period that number would look better than it does.

Ms. NORWOOD. The number of persons working part time for economic reasons did go down slightly this month, by roughly, 200,000. But you're quite right, 5.6 million is a very high number especially for this stage of recovery. I don't know the reason.

I suspect that many employers are being very cautious about expanding their payrolls too fast. Slack work is given as the reason for roughly half the group. They have jobs but there is not enough work for a full-time schedule. But the other half of them, roughly 2.8 million, are people who were looking for work and were only able to find part-time work even though they wanted full-time work.

But you know, this is happening at the same time that the average workweek is really extraordinarily high by historical standards. So it is somewhat puzzling. I don't think there's any question about that.

Some of it may be due to the restructuring, in a sense, that is going on within manufacturing. We have a number of manufacturing industries that are not growing. They haven't had a net job gain during 26 months of recovery. And yet we have others that are, really, doing extraordinarily well.

Mr. PLEWES. The slack-work component of involuntary part-time work has, indeed, behaved cyclically. It came down sharply early in the recovery period and more slowly after that. The other component—persons who can only find part-time jobs is coming down, but slowly. It seems to us that there may be an increasing propensity on the part of employers to offe, only part-time work and, therefore, we have to speculate as to why.

One reason may be that they're still timid as the Commissioner said. Another reason that was suggested to us by our Business Research Advisory Committee recently is that part-time workers require a smaller benefit package and less of a long-term commitment to benefits and pension plans than do full-time workers.

Ms. NORWOOD. One of the interesting bits of information that I have is that I'm on an advisory committee for Statistics Canada and one of the things the Canadians are concerned about is that most of their growth has been in the development of part-time jobs. It is not true in the United States. But the Canadians have found that the growth in their employment—growth of jobs—has been mainly in part-time jobs.

Representative OBEY. Thank you.

Senator Proxmire.

Senator PROXMIRE. Ms. Norwood, I know you do your very best to make your figures as precise and accurate as possible and always give us fair warning on it.

Let me ask, however, about the figures of this month—or, last month. In your prepared statement you point out—and I quote:

> This year there were smaller than usual declines in construction, retail trade, services, in part because the survey week was earlier than usual. The weather was comparatively mild.

The survey week was January 6-12.

Now the weather in much of the Nation now and for much of—for the rest of January is, to put it mildly, is not mild.

Ms. **Norwood**. That's right.

Senator **Proxmire**. And we can't always count on favorable timing of the survey week and, therefore, it appears that we may have underestimated the rising unemployment because that severe weather we've had lately, it seems to me, would certainly have an influence in discouraging construction, for example, and all kinds of outdoor employment.

Ms. **Norwood**. I think we kind of expect that the weather will be different when we look at the February data. I don't know how different or what those effects will be. And I am not sure how much of an effect this has had but I think we should recognize if you have mild weather and you can have more construction activity it is possible there are more jobs than you would normally have.

And you're quite right. If we were to have very bad weather all over the country, that's going to mean less construction activity for the month of February.

Senator **Proxmire**. Then there's another reason—the paper this morning reports in January that I don't think we included in the report that we have due to the fact that it's the first week. It says:

> Retail change posted disappointing results for January. Most retailers reported single-digit sales gains and three—Mobil's Montgomery Ward unit, Mercantile Stores and Edson Brothers—said sales fell from a year earlier. Cold weather and weak consumer spending were cited.

Is it possible that that also is an indication that maybe January was a little worse than was measured by that early week?

Ms. **Norwood**. I think it's interesting to look at different interpretations of the same set of data. This morning's Washington Post listed some figures on retail sales, compared to a year ago, that is, January over January for some of the major retail establishments and they showed some really substantive percentage increases: 16.3, 7.4, 12.7, 9.7, and 9.3 percent. The lowest increase: 4.7 percent, was listed for the Federated Department Stores and that's fairly flat if you take inflation into account.

So I think what that's saying is that there has been some growth in retail sales. On the other hand that may be because there are more sales, that is, prices may have been reduced more than usual.

Mr. **Plewes**. I think I have something to add that may be useful. Retail trade employment went up by about 130,000. If we look at some of the subgroups under that it helps us to understand where it came from. For example, jobs in the general merchandise stores we're talking about went up 22,000. Food stores went up by 13,000 jobs. Automobile dealers and service stations went up by 8,000. And eating and drinking places—restaurants and the like—went up by 34,000.

Ms. **Norwood**. All after seasonal adjustment.

Mr. **Plewes**. All after seasonal adjustments. So it was widespread in the retail sector and it wasn't all in the general merchandise area.

Ms. Norwood. The 130,000 increase may be something of an exaggeration, but I think there was, nevertheless, considerable growth in retail trade compared to what is usual in January.

Representative Obey. So you wouldn't agree with the statement that, "Retail sales change posted disappointing results for January"?

Ms. Norwood. Well, you know, I'm not quite sure what "disappointing" is. I'm sure that some of the employers may feel that way.

Representative Obey. They may have expected a really bonanza year and they just got a good one and that wasn't enough for them.

Now, until recently labor force growth during this recovery period has been relatively slow. Between December and January the labor force grew by over 400,000 following an increase almost that large the month before. At previous hearings you attributed the slower labor force growth to demographic factors, fewer teenagers in the population, tapering off women's labor force participation rates, and so forth.

Does your report today which shows the female labor participation rate rising to 54.4 percent, indicate a change in this trend and should we expect additional labor force increases from discouraged workers as well as women in the months ahead?

Ms. Norwood. I believe that women are beginning to resume their increase in labor force participation. However, the number of teenagers in the labor force declined over the recovery period by some 5 percent. So I think that's something that is very different from before.

As I said earlier, it is a little too soon to focus on this big surge in labor force participation of adult women. That's a very high rate, 54.4 percent, and my view is that there will be continued strength in labor force growth of women but I would not be at all surprised if next month there were a little slowdown in the labor force growth. Our labor force figures tend to move with surges and then a few months of being level or even going negative and then coming back again.

So I think there is an increase in labor force participation of women and, in fact, one of the things we plan to do before next month's hearing is to try to take a more careful look at what is going on there.

Representative Obey. Now putting that together, the demographic figures and the expected rate of growth, I notice that the consensus of economists is that we'll have a pretty good year in 1985 with growth of around 3 to 4 percent, but not much improvement—or deterioration for that matter—in unemployment.

Fortune magazine, on the other hand, says that they forecast growth will be a little less than 3 percent. Unemployment will increase.

I know that you don't make forecasts, but in your view if we have a growth rate of about 3 percent or so would that mean that unemployment is likely, other things being equal, to remain about where it is or gradually rise? What's your expectation?

Ms. Norwood. It's going to be very difficult to reduce unemployment if the labor force continues to grow, say, 3.5 percent or so per year. We're going to have to keep running, in a sense, in production and the economy just to stand still.

And there are lots of different estimates of what is going to happen to the labor force. I think one of the signs that is positive in terms at least of the unemployment situation is that we are continuing to have a decline in the number of young people entering the labor force just because fewer of them were born to grow up and to enter the labor force in the 1980's compared to the 1960's and 1970's. Since young people have very high unemployment rates generally, they tend to push the unemployment rate up.

I think—as I've said—that women are going to resume their labor force growth but certainly not at the pace that they increased in the 1960's and the 1970's. I think they've already shown that they are going to be increasing over the last year; 54.4 percent is an extraordinarily high figure as we described—it's the highest ever.

Representative **Obey**. Well, let me just give you some assumptions: Assume that we will have a growth in the labor force that averages about what we've had during the past 5 years. Assume we have economic growth of about 3 percent—real growth—in GNP. That's fairly close to the consensus.

Does that mean that we'll get no real improvement in unemployment probably in the next year if those are the facts?

Ms. **Norwood**. It would be very difficult. It certainly would.

I happen to have here the data for the 26 months of recovery in 1975, after the 1975 recession and 26 months after the 1982 recession. And if you look at those data you see first of all that in the 26 months from March of 1975 to May of 1977, the labor force grew at a 5.9 percent rate. In the current recovery it grew at roughly a little more than half that rate, 3.5 percent. But the important thing is that the composition of labor force growth is very different in the two recoveries. The one group that grew faster in percentage terms during the current recovery is the black population. And that, of course, will put more upward pressure on unemployment because—as you and I have discussed very often—their rates are extraordinarily high.

So I think there's a lot of difference in the composition of the labor force and this will have some effect on the unemployment rate because some groups of the population have a harder time in the labor market than others.

But you're quite right that the labor force continues to grow and that the economy had to grow in order to provide jobs for those people and that if it doesn't grow enough then you're going to have problems in reducing unemployment.

Senator **Proxmire**. In other words, another indication of weakness in the economy in the future as far as employment is concerned. You reported that the length of the workweek in manufacturing, which has been comparatively high throughout the recovery, declined last month. Of course, that may be a harbinger of people being laid off. The first thing that is done is the hours of work go down, that overtime goes down and so forth.

What, if anything, do such changes in factory hours suggest about employment growth in manufacturing industries?

Ms. **Norwood**. Manufacturing hours are only down a tenth of an hour in January and the average workweek in some of the industries is still fairly high. If you look, for example, at manufacturing as a whole or durable goods, the workweek is about where it was last fall, in September.

Senator **Proxmire**. And the unemployment rate in manufacturing is up significantly, right? So you have the hours of work down, unemployment up, and up significantly?

Ms. **Norwood**. The January increase in unemployment for workers in manufacturing industries was not significant.

Senator **Proxmire**. Now, one aspect of the misery index that usually isn't measured is the number of people who are unemployed but not drawing unemployment compensation.

What proportion of the unemployed are drawing unemployment compensation, unemployment insurance?

Ms. **Norwood**. According to our figures, 38 percent.

Senator **Proxmire**. 38 percent?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes, sir.

Senator **Proxmire**. In other words, about 6 out of 10 are not who are out of work. Now the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program expires in March. That currently provides additional benefits to jobless workers who've exhausted the 26 weeks typically available under the regular State program. You report that in January 1.3 million or 15 percent of the unemployed were jobless for 27 weeks or more. How many of these workers are reached by the FSC Program?

Ms. **Norwood**. We don't really know that, Senator Proxmire. We don't know what really happens to people after they've exhausted their benefits and it's very hard for us to track these people. As we've discussed many times, there are problems in terms of the statistical aspects of the unemployment insurance data.

Mr. **Plewes**. 250,000 in September, for example, have exhausted benefits. The number on extended benefits in January, our survey week, was about 300,000 versus the number of over a million who were unemployed 27 weeks or more.

Senator **Proxmire**. And how many of these workers—the long-term unemployed—are reached by the FSC Program?

Ms. **Norwood**. There were 314,000 persons during the survey week on extended benefits.

Senator **Proxmire**. Are the number of long-term unemployment workers—is that percentage still very high?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes, it is very high. It declined by 100,000 over the month but it's still at 1.3 million. That's quite a high number.

Senator **Proxmire**. That's quite high compared to past experience with this level of unemployment.

Ms. **Norwood**. Well, I'm pleased to see some movement in that figure because it had been stuck at 1.4 million since October.

Senator **Proxmire**. How quickly, on the average, do people find jobs after their unemployment insurance runs out?

Ms. **Norwood**. I don't have any figures.

Senator **Proxmire**. The chairman has very graciously permitted me to go ahead and I'm going to impose on him just a little bit longer.

Ms. Norwood, our trade deficit last year was $123 billion. How many jobs were lost because of that deficit?

Ms. **Norwood**. I don't know.

Senator **Proxmire**. Can you find out and let us know for the record?

Ms. **Norwood**. I don't think anyone can really calculate that.

Senator **Proxmire**. Why not?

Ms. **Norwood**. It is very difficult to determine what the changes would be in the economy as a whole if you started producing something that you are not now producing. The major reason we're importing goods is because it's more efficient to do so because they're cheaper. If we were to produce those imports ourselves the answer would depend on what the conditions were that we imported them on and then what happened to the shift in resources that might occur in the rest of the economy.

I just don't think that one can come up with a very good figure. It's a little bit easier to look at the jobs related to exports.

Senator **Proxmire**. Have the people who put the numbers into econometric models come up with answers? Are they unable to do that in this case?

Ms. **Norwood**. Well, there are a lot of people who come up with a lot of answers but I don't think that there is any way to come up with one that has enough validity to publish it.

Senator **Proxmire**. Can't even make an estimate on them?

Ms. **Norwood**. No.

Senator **Proxmire**. You would agree that when we have that kind of a deficit it does have a depressing effect on our job market, we lose jobs. Would we be better off if we had a trade balance?

Ms. **Norwood**. We certainly would have a different economy.

Senator **Proxmire**. From that standpoint?

Ms. **Norwood**. We have problems in having a very large trade deficit, there's no question about that. I'm not sure, however, that we would necessarily have more jobs if we did not import as many goods because the trade deficit, of course, is also having an effect on the economy and there are places where there are jobs that are being created.

I think that one needs to be rather careful of translating the deficit into the job market. There are—as you well know—very serious financial problems related to the trade deficit.

Senator **Proxmire**. Let me ask you if there's any rule of thumb for translating a loss of, say, a billion dollars in exports to the number of jobs we lose?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes, one can use input-output analysis and input-output tables to do that, and we can provide you with those figures. But those figures are based upon the assumption that everything else remains the same and if we were in this country to do something, for example, to shut off all imports and to produce those goods that we are now importing, nothing would remain the same. There would be all kinds of shifts in factors of production and from industry to industry and so I don't think those figures can be relied upon.

Senator **Proxmire**. Well, is it possible that the growth of GNP and stable prices and stable interest rates—or declining interest rates—in spite of record Federal deficits is the result of the strong dollar and the inflow on capital and goods?

Ms. NORWOOD. The inflow of imports is having an effect clearly on prices, on our CPI. And the effect on interest rates is also somewhat speculative, as you well know, because there are different theories about whether some of this is coming back to us because we are reducing our investments abroad and how much of it is coming because the United States is a safe haven for foreigners so that it is a little tricky to analyze these relationships.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well we do know that, of course, the fact that we're able to lean on other countries for capital opposed to on the cost account; opposed to on the basis of extent. We couldn't do that, obviously, in this case it would have to be higher.

Now, you report that the current recovery is 26 months old. Since World War II how long, on the average, does a recovery period last?

Ms. NORWOOD. I do have that. It's one of the longer ones. I can't put my finger on it.

Senator PROXMIRE. Let me—counting only 6 peace-time recoveries what's the average length?

This is already longer than most, right?

Ms. NORWOOD. Of the seven previous post-World War II recoveries two lasted less time than the current one has up to this point.

Senator PROXMIRE. And we have 9 million people out of work; 8.5 million—excuse me—adjusted; 7.2 percent of the work force, very high historically and we're—we have a mature recovery.

Now you report that because the 1980 census found a larger Hispanic population, various adjustments have been made in the employment and unemployment levels for this group. This report this morning reflects that.

Ms. Norwood. That's right.

Senator PROXMIRE. Did these revisions have any effect on the overall unemployment rate?

Ms. NORWOOD. No sir, it did not. It did not even have much of an effect on the Hispanic unemployment rate. It affected the levels both of employment and unemployment for Hispanics only.

Senator PROXMIRE. To what extent?

Ms. NORWOOD. We——

Senator PROXMIRE. Tend to increase the level reported?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes. For both employment and unemployment of Hispanics only the level was increased.

Senator PROXMIRE. If you hadn't made that adjustment would you have been reporting the same level of unemployment to us this morning?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, we would.

Senator PROXMIRE. Besides Hispanics, are there any other new adjustments of data that BLS has introduced in the January report?

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes, there are some changes in the statistical estimation procedure. They are highly technical and we calculated the data for December both ways and looked at the December to January change and there was no noticeable difference.

Senator PROXMIRE. How many States still have unemployment rates above the national average?

Mr. **Plewes**. The most recent data we have again is for the month of November. During that month, perhaps——

Senator **Proxmire**. You have nothing more recent than November?

Ms. **Norwood**. Not for all States. There's a 2-month lag for all except 11 large States.

Senator **Proxmire**. But this is the first time you've been able to report to us on the——

Mr. **Plewes**. On the States with unemployment higher than the national average in November, yes. These are Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, New Mexico, Nevada, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, and Puerto Rico.

Senator **Proxmire**. What was the last one?

Mr. **Plewes**. Puerto Rico.

Senator **Proxmire**. Doesn't include Wisconsin?

Mr. **Plewes**. No, you dropped out.

Senator **Proxmire**. That's what happens when Obey becomes chairman of the Joint Economic Committee.

Representative **Obey**. Thank you, Senator.

Ms. Norwood, I should respond to Senator Proxmire's comments earlier. I have to say that I certainly didn't expect to be spending the last 2 weeks trying to figure out what happened to the Joint Economic Committee. I had expected to spend it recovering from a hernia operation and I just want to thank you for coming here again this morning.

I, frankly, get frustrated hearing your remarks because, talking about monthly changes—it isn't the whole story but nonetheless, it's something we have to do. I guess the only comment that I would say is the one that Senator Proxmire is bringing out in his question. I guess what distressed me is that we were supposed to be looking at long-term trends and that this far into a recovery we have still a huge number of people here who are not part of the economic mainstream.

It certainly indicates this country hasn't learned how to really deal with unemployment rates without getting up inflation. I think it indicates that this year we're going to concentrate almost exclusively on economic policy to deal with those problems. There've been a hell of a lot of people for a long time who have not been sharing whatever recovery the rest of the country enjoys.

I really think that therein lies one of the obligations of this committee. We have got to focus on how we might deal with these problems. Again, I think it's your job.

In terms of the trade deficit, I don't know what it means in terms of overall jobs. All I do know, coming from a rural district as Senator Abdnor does, is that considerable stress falls in individual sectors. I find it very difficult to believe that the stress is not significantly related to overall fiscal policy. Certainly there's a thread that runs from that through the trade imbalance, through the interest rates.

Senator **Proxmire**. Can I just take a couple of minutes and I apologize for taking so much time but I think this is a fascinating area. Would you agree that were it not for the strong increase in defense production over, say, the past year unemployment and manufacturing and total unemployment would be significantly higher today?

Let me give you some figures on that.

Ms. NORWOOD. Higher or lower?

Senator PROXMIRE. That unemployment——

Ms. NORWOOD. Oh, unemployment, I'm sorry.

Senator PROXMIRE. That unemployment would be higher.

Ms. NORWOOD. Defense expenditures have created a large number of jobs, certainly.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, and the figures are really very, very impressive. For instance, the nondefense output in equipment has dropped since July, gone down. Not a great deal but it's gone down. Defense has gone up and gone up very sharply 135.9—that was the index in July—to 141.7. So isn't it correct that since July 1984, production of defense and space equipment rose substantially while nondefense, business production, has actually declined? That seems to be the figures and economic indicators.

Ms. NORWOOD. I'm not familiar enough with those figures to interpret the declines. We have tried to track defense related civilian employment and have had great difficulty because there is so much contracting out of defense expenditures that it's rather hard to get at each individual establishment.

However, you're quite right that there has been a lot of employment in manufacturing generated by defense orders.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, I was going to ask—the unemployment rate in manufacturing is 7.6 percent—went up 0.4 percent in the past month. Why was there such a sharp rise. Is that the defense, is that an explanation of that, too?

Ms. NORWOOD. It is partly, I think, because of the difficulties that some industries are in. Employment in some industries is still going down. If you looked at the whole primary metals group, for example, they're not doing well. They're still declining.

Senator PROXMIRE. Is it possible to estimate unemployment in defense and nondefense industries?

Ms. NORWOOD. We have not been able to come up with estimates that we can stand behind, in large part, because of the difficulty. We've looked at it in a different way. We try to look at employment, which is somewhat easier, because we do have a survey of business establishments. But even there, we have found it very difficult to identify the amount of employment that is related to defense, since so much of that is based upon a system of contracting, so that a small part of production in one place or another may be related to defense.

Senator PROXMIRE. Well, is it fair to say that unemployment in nondefense manufacturing went up by more than 0.4 percent since December, in view of the fact the unemployment rate in manufacturing went up 0.4 percent and that includes defense? You can't say that?

Ms. NORWOOD. No. It's possible. I just don't know.

Senator PROXMIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative OBEY. One last question. You indicated that it was very difficult to track what actually happens to the people who were unemployed and wound up dropping off the eligibility lists.

As you know, the Congress last year, my other hat, in the House Appropriations Committee, we provided $5 million, I believe is the number, for the purpose, really, at the urging of Congressman Ford, of trying to establish just such a study. It would figure out exactly what happens to people, after that happens.

Can you tell me what the status of that is?

Ms. **Norwood**. We did, last year, as the Congress directed, begin some considerable pilot work—using fiscal year 1984 funds for work in eight track States. These States are currently developing the program to identify and track persons affected by mass layoffs. The Office of Management and Budget informed the Appropriations Committees of a deferral of the allocation of that money to the Bureau in this fiscal year, and I'm sure that will be all straightened out in the next few weeks.

Representative **Obey**. Me, too. [Laughter.]

Thank you very much. The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:29 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT

FRIDAY, MARCH 8, 1985

Congress of the United States,
Joint Economic Committee,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:40 a.m., in room 2359, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. David R. Obey (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Obey, Hawkins, and Lungren; and Senator Proxmire.

Also present: Charles H. Bradford, assistant director; and William R. Buechner and Christopher J. Frenze, professional staff members.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE OBEY, CHAIRMAN

Representative **Obey**. We have with us this morning Janet Norwood who will be giving us the latest employment numbers from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Before we proceed I would like to make just a short statement.

Since May of last year the civilian unemployment rate has remained virtually unchanged, fluctuating from somewhere between 7.1 and 7.5 percent, and the 7.3 percent announced today by the BLS fits right into that pattern. It shows that our economy is making no new progress for the 8.4 million people who want work but can't find it.

Last year, the gross national product rose about 6.9 percent, the best performance in 30 years. Corporate profits were a record $287 billion. Per capita disposal income rose 5.8 percent, the best since 1973. This is welcome news and we should be very happy about it.

But the fact is that, as the jobless figures continue to demonstrate, there is considerable hardship still being felt by millions of people who are being left behind. Part-time workers who want full-time jobs but still can't find them; people who've given up looking for jobs and aren't even counted among the officially unemployed; displaced workers who depend on wives and teenagers to hold the family budget together; and the long-term unemployed whose unemployment benefits are expiring.

The hardship felt by all of these people is an economic and a moral cloud over the recovery and the recovery alone is not dealing with their problem.

There are two other issues of immediate concern which the Congress will be dealing with in the coming months, the expiration of the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program at the end of this month, and the administration's plans to reduce the budget of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, particularly the rescission of funding for the mass layoff report which I will want to get into in a few moments.

I hope we can address these and other issues this morning and Ms. Norwood, I welcome you here.

Senator Lungren, did you want to say anything before we begin?

Representative LUNGREN. Yes, I'll accept the nomination.

Representative OBEY. I'm sorry; that's right.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE LUNGREN

Representative LUNGREN. Yes, I'd like to join the chairman in welcoming you, Commissioner Norwood, this morning. We, obviously, may look at things a little differently up here on the panel. The glass is either half full or half empty, I guess, depending upon your perspective and although there is the continuation of unemployment at levels that we would all like to get down, there is some good news that you bring to us.

One of the most interesting things that I find is that the labor force participation rate, at 64.8 percent as I understand it, is an all-time high. In February, the employment population ratio climbed to its record level of 60.1 percent first set in 1979. So both the labor force participation and employment population ratio for adult women are now at new highs.

I don't mean by saying this that everything is rosy, but I think that those type of figures are something that we ought to look at because that's something we've never had before. It also indicates there are some new challenges out for all of us, Democrat, Republican, Liberal, Conservative, alike. And my hope is that with the Index of Leading Indicators projecting continued economic growth in the months ahead that we can expect further employment gains.

Again, I would like to thank you for appearing before us here and I look forward to hearing your testimony.

Representative OBEY. Let me just say that I will apologize to Representative Fiedler for calling Representative Lungren, Senator.

Representative LUNGREN. That's all right. Senator Cranston appreciates your remarks, too.

Representative OBEY. Senator Proxmire.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Senator PROXMIRE. I'd just like to make a very brief announcement. Unfortunately, I'm going to have to leave because we have a resolution coming before the Defense Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee and I have to be there for it.

Before I do I did want to—you know, Brother Lungren always brings out the little lingering claim of Democrat in him. There's not much left but there's some. [Laughter.]

Every time I hear him I've got to come forward and point out, among other things, that the diffusion index is at 47 percent, the first time in 5 months.

What that suggests to me is that there are a number of industries that are in trouble in this country. Our service sector is doing all right but our manufacturing sector is having a lot of trouble competing with foreign importers and having trouble exporting. And that, it seems to me, is reflected here.

Furthermore, the workweek dropped sharply. Now, I'm sure weather had something to do with that but it went from 40.6 to 40.0 hours per week and that certainly is a significant and clear indicator. That certainly bothers me.

And I notice the Wall Street Journal reports this morning that retailers generally reported small gains for February as merchants struggled to reduce big inventories left over from last year's sluggish holiday selling season.

So, the whole outlook seems to me to be not good and we still have, as the chairman has pointed out, a serious problem of unemployment—8.5 million Americans out of work, the rate remaining above 7 percent. Not long ago that was what would be happening at the depth of a recession and now we're supposed to be in a recovery.

So, I think there's a lot to be concerned about here, although, you do have a flicker of good news, hint of suggestion, whisper.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative Obey. Congressman Hawkins, we don't want to leave you out.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS

Representative Hawkins. No, I guess I—the bipartisan spirit in me is flickering, I guess. I'd rather listen to Ms. Norwood and only suggest that instead of waiting for these figures to come out every month we should be doing something about changing them and not merely being observers. We're the policymakers and it just seems to me that whether the unemployment rate is going up or down, that depends on what we do and we shouldn't be spectators in the process, but we should go about our business of legislating.

Thank you.

Representative Obey. Ms. Norwood, please proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, ACCOMPANIED BY KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS; JOHN E. BREGGER, DIVISION CHIEF, EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT ANALYSIS; AND JEROME A. MARK, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF PRODUCTIVITY AND TECHNOLOGY

Ms. Norwood. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I have with me on my right, Kenneth Dalton, who is in charge of our price program and on my left, Jack Bregger, who is our specialist in analysis of employment and unemployment from the household survey as well as the establishment survey.

We're very pleased to be here this morning to try to offer a few comments to supplement our press release.

Employment rose moderately in February while unemployment was little changed from the January level. The overall jobless rate was 7.2 percent in February and the civilian worker rate was 7.3 percent. The number of unemployed persons was 8.4 million after seasonal adjustment.

Both the level and the rate of unemployment have changed little since last May following steady declines throughout 1983 and the first half of 1984.

Payroll employment in nonfarm business establishments rose by 120,000 in February, following a much more substantial increase in January. Large over-the-month gains in the service-producing sector were partly offset by declines in the goods-producing sector, particularly in manufacturing.

The BLS diffusion index, which is heavily weighted toward manufacturing industries, shows that employment increased in less than one-half of the 185 industries included in that index. This was the lowest index level in 5 months and substantially below the levels which have prevailed throughout most of the recovery period.

Strong over-the-month increases occurred in services, retail trade and finance, insurance, and real estate. These industries which, except for retail trade continued to grow during the 1981-82 recession, have shown solid growth rates during the last 27 months of economic expansion. Business services within the service industry, for example, has grown by close to 30 percent during the recovery. Indeed, one in every eight jobs gained during the recovery period has been in business services. Much of this growth has been in personnel supply and data processing services to other business establishments.

In contrast to the continued expansion in the service-producing sector, each of the industries in the goods-producing sector declined in February. The largest decline occurred in manufacturing where 75,000 jobs were lost. Within manufacturing, automobile employment fell by 25,000. Employment levels in this industry had increased steadily since last summer. Almost 250,000 jobs have been added in the auto industry during the 27 months of recovery and nearly 900,000 people are now employed there. With the chief exceptions of autos and electrical equipment, however, factory employment has shown little growth since last summer.

Construction employment declined by 50,000 in February. As you know, there've been continuing positive economic signs for this industry, including increases in housing starts, new construction permits, and favorable mortgage interest rates. I believe that this decline results from unusually severe winter weather in February which we understand actually shut down some construction projects. Since the February weather-related decline comes on the heels of milder-than-usual weather in the prior 2 months, it would be quite premature to draw definitive conclusions from the February change in construction.

Civilian employment, as measured by the household survey, rose by about 300,000 in February. Nearly all of the over-the-month gain was among women, teenagers, as well as adults. The number of working women has expanded by 1.7 million over the past year. Strong advances have taken place in the service producing sector of the economy and more than 8 out of every 10 working women are employed there.

The percentage of adult women who are employed, that is the employment-population ratio, reached 50.8 percent in February. This ratio has shown a long-term increase and except for brief dips during cyclical periods, continues to reach new record highs. The February increase helped to push the overall civilian employment-population ratio to 60.1 percent, equaling the previous all-time high last reached in December 1979.

The average workweek of production or nonsupervisory workers and private nonagricultural payrolls, which had been sustained at very high levels throughout most of the recovery period, declined two-tenths of an hour to 35 hours in February. Factory hours were down six-tenths of an hour—to 40 hours. Both measures were affected by the extremely bad weather that was concentrated in the heavy manufacturing areas of the Midwest, causing many plants to cancel shifts.

Despite the continuing expansion in employment, the Nation's jobless rate has held about steady over the past few months. Employment growth since last fall has been just sufficient to provide jobs to accommodate the fairly large increase in the number of persons coming into the labor force.

There was little change in jobless rates for most labor force groups in February. However, the rate for blacks, whose labor market problems continue to be more severe than those of white workers, rose to 16.3 percent; the rate had fluctuated near 15 percent since last summer. Nearly all of the increase in black joblessness took place among adult men and women. Because the figures for blacks are subject to greater month-to-month variability than those for whites, it is difficult to judge whether the February figures mean a further widening of the already large gap in black-white jobless rates. The employment-population ratio for blacks, at 52.7 percent in February, was substantially less than that for whites—61.1 percent.

Another group of workers who continue to have difficulty in the labor market are those who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more. Their number rose by 175,000 in February, to 2.4 million. They now comprise about 30 percent of the unemployed. That's down from a cyclical high of about 40 percent. In February, about 1.3 million of this group were jobless for 6 months or longer. In contrast to the long-duration unemployed, the number of workers employed part time for economic reasons declined significantly in February by nearly 300,000. There were still 5.3 million persons in this group.

In summary, the data for February show some contrasting movements in particular sectors of the economy and among particular labor force groups. Job gains continued in the service producing sector of the economy but factory employment declined over the month. The unemployment rate held about steady.

We'd be glad to try to answer any questions you may have, Mr. Chairman.

[The table attached to Ms. Norwood's statement, together with the press release referred to, follows:]

UNEMPLOYMENT RATES OF ALL CIVILIAN WORKERS BY ALTERNATIVE SEASONAL ADJUSTMENT METHODS

Month and year	Unadjusted rate	X—11 ARIMA method						X—11 method (official method before 1980)	Range (cols. 2-8)
		Official procedure	Concurrent (as first computed)	Concurrent (revised)	Stable	Total	Residual		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1984									
February	8.4	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.8	....
March	8.1	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.7	7.8	7.7	7.8	0.1
April	7.6	7.8	7.8	7.8	7.9	7.8	7.7	7.8	.2
May	7.2	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.5	7.8	7.5	.3
June	7.4	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.2	.1
July	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.5	7.5	7.5	.1
August	7.3	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.4	7.5	7.5	7.5	.1
September	7.1	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.4	....
October	7.0	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.3	.1
November	6.9	7.1	7.1	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.1	.1
December	7.0	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.2	7.1	7.1	.2
1985									
January	8.0	7.4	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.4	7.2	7.4	.2
February	7.8	7.3	7.3	7.3	7.2	7.3	7.2	7.3	.1

EXPLANATION OF COLUMN HEADS

(1) Unadjusted rate.—Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) Official procedure (X—11 **ARIMA** method).—The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components—agricultural employment, nonagricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 age-sex groups—males and females, ages 16 to 19 and 20 yr. and over—are seasonally adjusted independently using data from January 1974 forward. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using **ARIMA** [Auto-regressive, integrated, moving average] models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then seasonally adjusted with the X-11 portion of the X-11 **ARIMA** program. The 4 teenage unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the multiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating that total as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted series are revised at the end of each year. Extrapolated factors for January-June are computed at the beginning of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become available. Each set of 6-month factors are published in advance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of Employment and Earnings.

(3) Concurrent (as 1st computed, X-11 **ARIMA** method).—The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is seasonally adjusted with the X-11 **ARIMA** Program each month as the most recent data become available. Rates for each month of the current year are shown as 1st computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) Concurrent (revised, X-11 **ARIMA** method).—The procedure used is identical to (3) above, and the rate for the current month (the last month displayed) will always be the same in the 2 columns. However, all previous months are subject to revison each month based on the seasonal adjustment of all the components with data through the current month.

(5) Stable (X-11 **ARIMA** method).—Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using **ARIMA** models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year to year and computes final seasonal factors as unweighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure, factors are extrapolated in 6-mo intervals and the series are revised at the end of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical to the official procedure.

(6) Total (X-11 **ARIMA** method).—This is one alternative aggregation procedure, in which total unemployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with **ARIMA** models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X-11 part of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unemployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in 6-mo intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) Residual (X-11 **ARIMA** method).—This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using **ARIMA** models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted unemployment level is derived by subtracting seasonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-mo intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(8) X-11 method (official method before 1980).—The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with **ARIMA** models and the factors are projected in 12-mo intervals. The standard X-11 Program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

Methods of Adjustment.—The X-11 **ARIMA** method was developed at Statistics Canada by the seasonal adjustment and times series staff under the direction of Estela Bee Dagum. The method is described in "The X-11 **ARIMA** Seasonal Adjustment Method," by Estela Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalog No. 12-564E, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in "X-11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program," by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young, and John Musgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, March 1985.

News United States Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1371
523-1944
523-1959
Media contact: 523-1913

USDL 85-97

TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS
RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL
8:30 A.M. (EST), FRIDAY,
MARCH 8, 1985

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: FEBRUARY 1985

Employment rose slightly in February, while unemployment was little changed, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. The overall unemployment rate was 7.2 percent, and the rate for civilian workers was 7.3 percent. Both rates have fluctuated within a relatively narrow range since last May, after falling sharply in the preceding year and a half.

Civilian employment--as measured by the monthly survey of households--totaled 106.7 million in February, up nearly 300,000 over the month. The number of nonagricultural payroll jobs--as measured by the monthly survey of establishments--advanced by 120,000. Both measures of employment have risen by a little more than 400,000 since last December and by about 7-1/2 million since the recovery began in late 1982.

Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

Both the level of unemployment and the rate for all civilian workers were little changed in February at 8.4 million and 7.3 percent, respectively, after allowing for seasonality. None of the major age-sex groups showed any significant changes, but there were divergent movements between black and white workers. The unemployment rate for blacks rose by 1.4 percentage points to 16.3 percent, largely as a result of increased joblessness among adult men. The rate for whites eased down from 6.4 to 6.2 percent. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

The average duration of unemployment rose slightly in February, as the number unemployed for 15 to 26 weeks increased by 175,000 and the number out of work less than 5 weeks edged down. The number of persons jobless for 6 months or longer remained at 1.3 million. The median duration of unemployment was 7.2 weeks, and the average duration was 15.9 weeks. (See table A-7.)

The number of persons working part time for economic reasons--sometimes referred to as the partially unemployed--fell by 295,000 in February to 5.3 million. Almost all of this decline resulted from a drop in the number of people reporting short hours due to slack work; there was little change in the number who were unable to obtain full-time jobs. (See table A-4.)

Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Civilian employment rose to 106.7 million (seasonally adjusted) in February, continuing an uptrend that has totaled 2.7 million over the past year. Virtually all of the over-the-month increase took place among women 16 years of age and over. The civilian employment-population ratio, at 60.1 percent in February, equaled the all-time high for this series, last reached in 1979. (See table A-2.)

The civilian labor force, at 115.1 million, was little changed in February, and the labor force participation rate remained at 64.8 percent.

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

Category	Quarterly averages		Monthly data			Jan.-Feb. change
	1984		1984	1985		
	III	IV	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	
HOUSEHOLD DATA						
	Thousands of persons					
Labor force 1/	115,464	115,885	116,162	116,572	116,787	215
Total employment 1/	107,016	107,652	107,971	108,088	108,388	300
Civilian labor force	113,754	114,185	114,464	114,875	115,084	209
Civilian employment	105,306	105,951	106,273	106,391	106,685	294
Unemployment	8,447	8,233	8,191	8,484	8,399	-85
Not in labor force	62,841	62,948	62,842	62,509	62,432	-77
Discouraged workers	1,211	1,303	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
	Percent of labor force					
Unemployment rates:						
All workers 1/	7.3	7.1	7.1	7.3	7.2	-0.1
All civilian workers	7.4	7.2	7.2	7.4	7.3	-0.1
Adult men	6.4	6.2	6.3	6.3	6.3	0
Adult women	6.8	6.6	6.4	6.8	6.7	-0.1
Teenagers	18.6	18.4	18.8	18.9	18.4	-0.5
White	6.4	6.2	6.2	6.4	6.2	-0.2
Black	15.8	15.1	15.0	14.9	16.3	1.4
Hispanic origin	10.6	10.5	10.4	10.6	9.7	-0.9
ESTABLISHMENT DATA						
	Thousands of jobs					
Nonfarm payroll employment	94,560	95,445	95,681	95,993p	96,112p	119p
Goods-producing	25,056	25,154	25,258	25,332p	25,196p	-136p
Service-producing	69,504	70,291	70,423	70,661p	70,916p	255p
	Hours of work					
Average weekly hours:						
Total private nonfarm	35.3	35.2	35.3	35.2p	35.0p	-0.2p
Manufacturing	40.5	40.5	40.7	40.6p	40.0p	-0.6p
Manufacturing overtime	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3p	3.3p	0p

1/ Includes the resident Armed Forces. N.A.=not available.
p=preliminary.

The participation rate for adult women, which had risen sharply in January, edged up to 54.5 percent. Over the year, the labor force grew by 2.2 million, with adult women accounting for 70 percent of the increase.

Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Total nonagricultural payroll employment rose by 120,000 in February to 96.1 million, after seasonal adjustment. This increase reflected a continuation of strength within the service-producing sector that was partially offset by declines in the goods-producing industries. The service sector has accounted for four-fifths of the 3.2 million over-the-year increase in employment. February increases occurred in slightly fewer than half of the industries in the BLS index of diffusion, which is heavily weighted toward the goods industries. (See tables B-1 and B-6.)

The largest over-the-month increases took place in services and retail trade--about 100,000 each. Finance, insurance, and real estate also posted a sizable employment increase, and there was a modest gain in wholesale trade. Altogether, employment rose by 255,000 in the service-producing sector.

In contrast, employment declined in all three of the goods-producing industries. Manufacturing jobs fell by 75,000. Although declines were fairly pervasive, the bulk of this drop occurred in durable goods, most notably in the automobile industry, which decreased by 25,000. Auto employment levels had remained particularly strong in recent months. Elsewhere in durable goods, large declines occurred in the lumber and wood products, machinery, and fabricated metals industries. Within nondurable goods, the largest over-the-month losses were in the textile mill products and apparel industries.

Construction employment declined by 50,000 in February, after seasonal adjustment, in part the result of the extremely poor weather conditions. Milder-than-usual conditions in December and January had allowed wintertime construction activity to remain unusually high. The February decline in mining sustained a 5-month downtrend; much of the reduction occurred in oil and gas extraction.

Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

Average weekly hours for production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls, at 35.0 hours in February, seasonally adjusted, were down 0.2 hour over the month. (See table B-2.)

The manufacturing workweek decreased by 0.6 hour to 40.0 hours in February, while factory overtime, at 3.3 hours, was unchanged. Declines in the factory workweek were widespread, stemming from the unusually harsh weather that plagued the central portion of the United States during the survey reference week. The largest decrease took place in the automobile industry--2.3 hours.

Due to the drop in hours, the index of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonagricultural payrolls--which reflects developments in both hours and employment levels--dropped 0.3 percent to 114.4 (1977=100) in February. Indices declined sharply in construction and manufacturing. (See table B-5.)

Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings rose 0.5 percent in February, and weekly earnings were about unchanged, after seasonal adjustment. Prior to seasonal adjustment, average hourly earnings increased 1 cent to $8.51, and average weekly earnings were down $1.35 to $295.30. Over the past year, hourly earnings were up 27 cents, and weekly earnings rose $6.90. (See table B-3.)

The Hourly Earnings Index (Establishment Survey Data)

The Hourly Earnings Index (HEI) was 163.7 (1977=100) in February, seasonally adjusted, an increase of 0.6 percent from January. For the 12 months ended in February, the increase (before seasonal adjustment) was 3.3 percent. The HEI excludes the effects of two types of changes unrelated to underlying wage rate movements--fluctuations in overtime in manufacturing and interindustry employment shifts. In dollars of constant purchasing power, the HEI decreased 0.5 percent during the 12-month period ended in January. (See table B-4.)

Explanatory Note

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey (household survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 59,500 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonagricultural payrolls that appears in the B tables, marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by BLS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes approximately 200,000 establishments employing over 35 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

Coverage, definitions, and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as *unemployed*, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time; and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Also included among the unemployed are persons not looking for work because they were laid off and waiting to be recalled and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days.

The *labor force* equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The *unemployment rate* is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1 and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroll records of nonagricultural firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey excludes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces.

The household survey includes people on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not.

The household survey is limited to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age.

The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each individual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, employees working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

Seasonal adjustment

Over the course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 95 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity.

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemployment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January–June period and again for the July–December period. The January revision is applied to data that have been published over the previous 5 years. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are calculated only once a year, along with the introduction of new benchmarks which are discussed at the end of the next section.

Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from these surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are approximately 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At approximately the 90-percent level of confidence—the confidence limits used by BLS in its analyses—the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 328,000; for total unemployment it is 220,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.19 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of teenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .26 percentage point; for teenagers, it is 1.25 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment—against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS. It is available for $4.50 per issue or $31.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20204. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M, O, P, and Q of that publication.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status and sex	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Feb. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate[3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total employed[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[4]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Agriculture	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate[5]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Not in labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate[3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total employed[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[4]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate[5]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional population[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate[3]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Total employed[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[4]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Resident Armed Forces	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate[5]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

---

[1] The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States.

[3] Labor force as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[4] Total employment as a percent of the noninstitutional population.

[5] Unemployment as a percent of the labor force including the resident Armed Forces.

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Feb. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985
TOTAL									
Civilian noninstitutional population	175,679	177,384	177,516	175,679	176,956	177,135	177,306	177,384	177,516
Civilian labor force	111,368	113,475	113,582	112,726	114,718	114,076	114,469	114,875	115,084
Participation rate	63.4	64.0	64.0	64.2	64.8	64.4	64.6	64.8	64.9
Employed	101,961	104,344	104,690	103,888	105,648	105,912	106,273	106,391	106,483
Employment-population ratio[2]	58.0	58.8	59.0	59.1	59.7	59.8	59.9	60.0	60.1
Unemployed	9,407	9,131	8,892	8,838	8,967	8,162	8,191	8,484	8,599
Unemployment rate	8.4	8.0	7.8	7.8	7.3	7.1	7.2	7.4	7.3
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	75,794	76,767	76,829	75,788	76,565	76,661	76,733	76,760	76,828
Civilian labor force	58,964	59,574	59,557	59,372	59,813	59,994	60,131	60,033	60,061
Participation rate	77.8	77.6	77.5	78.3	78.1	78.3	78.4	78.2	78.2
Employed	54,220	55,183	55,240	55,233	56,187	56,269	56,521	56,734	56,287
Employment-population ratio[2]	71.5	71.8	71.9	72.9	73.4	73.4	73.6	73.9	73.3
Agriculture	2,158	2,173	2,123	2,194	2,376	2,434	2,494	2,417	2,387
Nonagricultural industries	52,062	53,010	53,117	53,034	53,848	53,835	53,878	53,827	53,928
Unemployed	4,743	4,391	4,317	4,139	3,731	3,725	3,756	3,788	3,774
Unemployment rate	8.0	7.4	7.2	7.0	6.2	6.2	6.3	6.3	6.3
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian noninstitutional population	84,447	85,713	85,788	84,847	85,193	85,487	85,645	85,511	85,788
Civilian labor force	43,223	45,629	45,774	45,313	47,284	48,278	48,463	48,771	48,884
Participation rate	51.2	54.0	54.3	53.3	51.9	55.9	56.7	56.8	56.9
Employed	40,048	41,737	41,812	42,138	43,781	43,757	43,511	43,615	43,708
Employment-population ratio[2]	47.5	50.4	50.7	49.8	49.2	50.4	50.8	50.3	50.8
Agriculture	594	576	502	627	569	560	565	592	614
Nonagricultural industries	39,532	42,848	42,110	41,551	42,712	42,837	42,819	43,018	43,173
Unemployed	3,176	3,357	3,147	3,185	3,513	3,521	2,952	3,161	3,176
Unemployment rate	7.2	7.3	6.9	6.9	6.6	6.5	6.6	6.9	6.7
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian noninstitutional population	14,931	14,811	14,650	14,931	14,758	14,771	14,557	14,815	14,650
Civilian labor force	7,182	7,277	7,256	8,058	7,838	7,801	7,830	8,072	8,129
Participation rate	47.1	49.9	49.7	53.8	53.1	53.5	54.1	55.2	55.7
Employed	5,847	5,460	5,638	6,477	6,516	6,411	6,397	6,547	6,630
Employment-population ratio[2]	38.1	37.0	41.0	43.4	43.7	43.5	43.9	44.9	45.4
Agriculture	192	181	206	339	266	325	294	311	364
Nonagricultural industries	5,555	5,619	5,432	6,138	6,110	6,091	6,104	6,236	6,266
Unemployed	1,398	1,617	1,618	1,582	1,383	1,390	1,485	1,525	1,499
Unemployment rate	19.3	22.2	22.3	19.6	18.7	17.8	18.9	18.9	18.4

---

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted[1]					
	Feb. 1986	Jan. 1987	Feb. 1987	Feb. 1986	Oct. 1986	Nov. 1986	Dec. 1986	Jan. 1987	Feb. 1987
WHITE									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
BLACK									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
HISPANIC ORIGIN									
Civilian noninstitutional population[1]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Participation rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Employment-population ratio[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

---

[1] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

[2] Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(Numbers in thousands)

Category	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
CHARACTERISTIC									
Civilian employed, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married men, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married women, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women who maintain families	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER									
Agriculture:									
Wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Self-employed workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unpaid family workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries:									
Wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Government	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Private industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Private households	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Other industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Self-employed workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Unpaid family workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PERSONS AT WORK PART TIME									
All industries:									
Part time for economic reasons	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Slack work	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Could only find part-time work	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Voluntary part time	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nonagricultural industries:									
Part time for economic reasons	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Slack work	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Could only find part-time work	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Voluntary part time	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Excludes persons "with a job but not at work" during the survey period for such reasons as vacation, illness, or industrial dispute.

Table A-5. Range of unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force, seasonally adjusted

(Percent)

Measure	Quarterly averages					Monthly data		
	[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible]	[illegible]	
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-1 Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-2 Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-3 Unemployed persons 25 years and over as a percent of the civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-4 Unemployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civilian labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-5a **Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces**	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-5b **Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force**	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-6 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons as a percent of the civilian labor force less ½ of the part-time labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
U-7 Total full-time jobseekers plus ½ part-time jobseekers plus ½ total on part time for economic reasons plus discouraged workers as a percent of the civilian labor force plus discouraged workers less ½ of the part-time labor force	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

N.A. = not available.

[illegible]

Table A-6. Selected unemployment indicators, seasonally adjusted

Category	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
CHARACTERISTIC									
Total, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Men, 20 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 16 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women, 20 years and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married men, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Married women, spouse present	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Women who maintain families	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Full-time workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Part-time workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Labor force time lost[2]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
INDUSTRY									
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Durable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Nondurable goods	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale and retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance and service industries	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Government workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Agricultural wage and salary workers	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

[2] Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force hours.

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Weeks of unemployment	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
DURATION									
Less than 5 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
5 to 14 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 to 26 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
27 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Average (mean) duration, in weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Median duration, in weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Less than 5 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
5 to 14 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 to 26 weeks	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
27 weeks and over	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

Reason	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED									
Job losers	5,471	5,233	4,947	4,736	4,281	4,161	4,176	4,313	4,251
On layoff	1,513	1,852	1,571	1,271	1,151	1,088	1,070	1,229	1,240
Other job losers	3,958	3,381	3,376	3,465	3,130	3,073	3,106	3,084	3,011
Job leavers	727	917	866	788	825	869	858	884	865
Reentrants	2,168	2,400	2,229	2,152	2,154	2,181	2,218	2,266	2,233
New entrants	981	881	913	1,102	1,062	1,026	1,011	1,049	1,035
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION									
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Job losers	58.5	55.1	55.0	53.8	51.3	50.5	50.5	50.8	50.7
On layoff	17.1	18.1	17.4	14.4	13.8	13.0	12.9	14.5	14.8
Other job losers	41.5	37.0	37.6	39.4	37.5	37.5	37.5	36.3	35.9
Job leavers	8.4	10.0	9.7	8.9	10.0	10.6	10.4	10.4	10.3
Reentrants	23.2	25.2	25.0	24.7	25.9	26.4	26.8	26.4	26.6
New entrants	10.4	9.7	10.2	12.5	12.8	12.5	12.2	12.4	12.3
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE									
Job losers	4.9	4.5	4.3	4.2	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.7
Job leavers	.7	.8	.8	.7	.7	.8	.7	.8	.8
Reentrants	1.9	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.9
New entrants	.9	.8	.8	1.0	.9	.9	.9	.9	.9

Table A-9. Unemployed persons by sex and age, seasonally adjusted

Sex and age	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)			Unemployment rates[1]					
	Feb. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985
Total, 16 years and over	8,836	8,484	8,398	7.8	7.3	7.1	7.2	7.4	7.3
16 to 24 years	3,426	3,051	3,281	14.3	13.5	13.2	13.5	13.6	13.7
16 to 19 years	1,362	1,325	1,479	19.4	18.7	17.8	18.9	18.9	18.4
16 to 17 years	468	673	628	22.1	20.2	20.0	21.0	21.2	20.0
18 to 19 years	894	652	851	17.8	17.4	16.8	17.7	17.6	17.4
20 to 24 years	1,866	1,726	1,782	11.7	11.5	10.9	10.9	10.9	11.2
25 years and over	5,407	5,233	5,118	6.1	5.7	5.5	5.5	5.8	5.6
25 to 54 years	4,737	4,656	4,519	6.3	5.9	5.8	5.4	6.1	5.9
55 years and over	632	632	597	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.1	4.2	3.9
Men, 16 years and over	4,969	4,679	4,792	7.6	7.1	7.0	7.1	7.2	7.1
16 to 24 years	1,871	1,743	1,806	14.7	13.8	13.7	14.1	13.8	14.4
16 to 19 years	829	811	814	19.9	19.9	18.9	19.6	19.1	19.5
16 to 17 years	349	356	348	22.2	21.3	20.3	19.8	21.2	20.1
18 to 19 years	479	461	466	18.3	18.9	18.3	19.3	18.0	18.6
20 to 24 years	1,042	934	988	11.7	10.9	11.2	11.5	11.2	12.0
25 years and over	3,096	2,913	2,774	6.1	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.5	5.6
25 to 54 years	2,673	2,494	2,519	6.6	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.8	5.6
55 years and over	453	377	352	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.4	4.3	4.0
Women, 16 years and over	3,869	3,835	3,807	7.8	7.5	7.3	7.2	7.7	7.5
16 to 24 years	1,555	1,536	1,475	13.9	13.2	12.6	12.8	13.3	12.9
16 to 19 years	733	714	681	18.9	17.4	16.6	18.1	18.6	17.3
16 to 17 years	353	321	322	21.7	19.0	19.7	22.1	21.2	18.6
18 to 19 years	379	387	365	17.2	15.5	15.1	16.0	16.7	16.2
20 to 24 years	822	792	794	11.3	11.1	10.7	10.2	10.5	10.8
25 years and over	2,321	2,299	2,331	6.2	6.0	5.7	5.6	6.1	5.9
25 to 54 years	2,062	2,111	2,109	6.5	6.2	6.1	6.0	6.4	6.3
55 years and over	259	256	239	4.1	4.8	3.9	3.7	4.2	3.8

[1] Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted¹					
	Feb. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985
Civilian noninstitutional population	23,600	24,282	24,325	23,600	24,451	24,477	24,572	24,282	24,325
Civilian labor force	14,397	15,142	15,130	14,617	15,486	15,468	15,540	15,415	15,361
Participation rate	61.0	62.4	62.2	61.9	63.3	63.2	63.2	63.5	63.1
Employed	12,237	13,055	12,942	12,418	13,347	13,356	13,420	13,310	13,125
Employment-population ratio²	51.9	53.8	53.2	52.6	54.6	54.6	54.6	54.8	54.0
Unemployed	2,159	2,087	2,189	2,199	2,139	2,112	2,120	2,105	2,236
Unemployment rate	15.0	13.8	14.5	15.0	13.8	13.7	13.6	13.7	14.6
Not in labor force	9,204	9,140	9,195	8,983	8,965	9,009	9,032	8,867	8,964

¹ The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

² Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional population.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Occupation	Civilian employed		Unemployed		Unemployment rate	
	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1985
Total, 16 years and over¹	101,961	104,680	9,407	8,902	8.4	7.8
Managerial and professional specialty	24,713	25,693	686	603	2.7	2.3
Executive, administrative, and managerial	11,329	11,987	346	345	3.0	2.8
Professional specialty	13,384	13,706	340	257	2.5	1.8
Technical, sales, and administrative support	31,729	32,739	1,883	1,775	5.6	5.1
Technicians and related support	3,117	3,202	113	112	3.5	3.4
Sales occupations	11,944	12,344	787	761	6.2	5.8
Administrative support, including clerical	16,668	17,193	983	902	5.6	5.0
Service occupations	13,861	14,257	1,456	1,398	9.5	8.9
Private household	989	1,030	73	60	6.8	5.5
Protective service	1,673	1,652	108	82	6.1	4.7
Service, except private household and protective	11,199	11,575	1,276	1,256	10.2	9.8
Precision production, craft, and repair	12,556	12,842	1,411	1,259	10.0	8.9
Mechanics and repairers	4,312	4,414	312	265	6.8	5.7
Construction trades	4,140	4,395	766	698	15.6	13.7
Other precision production, craft, and repair	4,104	4,033	333	298	7.5	6.8
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	16,180	16,258	2,568	2,457	13.7	13.1
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	7,815	7,819	1,052	1,071	11.8	12.1
Transportation and material moving occupations	4,270	4,474	541	533	11.2	10.6
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	4,095	3,965	975	853	19.2	17.7
Construction laborers	589	532	298	227	33.5	29.9
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3,506	3,433	677	625	16.2	15.4
Farming, forestry, and fishing	2,912	2,901	379	426	11.5	12.8

¹ Persons with no previous work experience and those whose last job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

Veteran status and age	Civilian noninstitutional population		Civilian labor force							
			Total		Employed		Unemployed			
							Number		Percent of labor force	
	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Feb. 1985
VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS										
Total, 30 years and over	7,752	9,144	8,886	9,086	8,378	8,666	502	418	5.7	4.6
30 to 44 years	8,164	8,311	8,259	8,263	7,708	7,888	544	374	7.2	4.5
30 to 34 years	2,881	2,482	2,767	2,423	2,487	2,300	280	123	10.0	5.0
35 to 39 years	3,089	3,394	3,178	3,158	2,911	3,046	267	169	8.0	5.3
40 to 44 years	2,194	2,435	2,743	2,782	1,767	2,485	73	82	4.2	3.2
45 years and over	587	1,024	1,138	841	700	788	38	42	4.9	5.0
NONVETERANS										
Total, 30 to 44 years	15,887	16,810	15,008	15,948	14,530	14,956	978	991	6.5	6.2
30 to 34 years	5,170	5,767	6,717	7,203	6,254	6,843	513	410	7.6	6.3
35 to 39 years	6,554	4,807	5,537	4,918	4,737	4,283	263	238	5.8	5.5
40 to 44 years	4,019	4,296	3,810	4,011	3,614	3,783	204	244	5.4	[illegible]

NOTE: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to those 30 to 44 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

Data for 25- to 29-year-old veterans are no longer shown in this table because the group is rapidly disappearing (into the 30-34 age category) and the numbers remaining for some labor force categories are not large enough to warrant their continued publication.

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for eleven large States

(Numbers in thousands)

State and employment status	Not seasonally adjusted			Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985	Feb. 1985
California									
Civilian noninstitutional population	18,886	19,161	19,182	18,886	19,086	19,111	19,137	19,161	19,182
Civilian labor force	12,228	12,761	12,713	12,316	12,623	12,609	12,635	12,815	12,803
Employed	11,156	11,738	11,769	11,331	11,680	11,686	11,734	11,886	11,950
Unemployed	1,073	1,024	944	985	943	923	901	930	853
Unemployment rate	8.8	8.0	7.4	8.0	7.5	7.3	7.1	7.3	6.7
Florida									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,516	8,691	8,706	8,516	8,644	8,660	8,676	8,691	8,706
Civilian labor force	5,017	5,237	5,246	5,090	5,104	5,121	5,170	5,311	5,322
Employed	4,709	4,895	4,940	4,765	4,783	4,823	4,868	4,981	4,999
Unemployed	308	342	305	325	321	298	302	330	323
Unemployment rate	6.1	6.5	5.8	6.4	6.3	5.8	5.8	6.2	6.1
Illinois									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,598	8,634	8,636	8,598	8,625	8,628	8,631	8,634	8,636
Civilian labor force	5,554	5,631	5,573	5,595	5,645	5,643	5,673	5,681	5,611
Employed	4,995	5,077	5,050	5,061	5,122	5,155	5,173	5,166	5,115
Unemployed	559	555	523	536	523	488	500	515	496
Unemployment rate	10.1	9.8	9.4	9.5	9.3	8.6	8.8	9.1	8.8
Massachusetts									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,499	4,544	4,547	4,499	4,532	4,536	4,540	4,544	4,547
Civilian labor force	2,885	3,019	3,039	3,039	3,049	3,058	3,061	3,037	3,095
Employed	2,706	2,882	2,906	2,868	2,931	2,929	2,930	2,931	2,980
Unemployed	180	138	133	171	118	130	131	105	115
Unemployment rate	6.3	4.6	4.4	5.6	3.9	4.3	4.3	3.4	3.7
Michigan									
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,741	6,794	6,798	6,741	6,780	6,785	6,789	6,794	6,798
Civilian labor force	4,250	4,309	4,329	4,311	4,395	4,416	4,384	4,396	4,393
Employed	3,714	3,790	3,888	3,816	3,916	3,924	3,918	3,912	3,990
Unemployed	536	520	441	495	479	492	466	484	403
Unemployment rate	12.6	12.1	10.2	11.5	10.9	11.1	10.6	11.0	9.2
New Jersey									
Civilian noninstitutional population	5,817	5,873	5,877	5,817	5,856	5,863	5,868	5,873	5,877
Civilian labor force	3,786	3,780	3,824	3,832	3,816	3,783	3,796	3,818	3,869
Employed	3,531	3,526	3,571	3,588	3,591	3,562	3,577	3,583	3,627
Unemployed	255	253	253	244	225	221	219	234	242
Unemployment rate	6.7	6.7	6.6	6.4	5.9	5.8	5.8	6.1	6.3
New York									
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,599	13,680	13,685	13,599	13,658	13,666	13,674	13,680	13,685
Civilian labor force	7,989	8,179	8,088	8,071	8,188	8,233	8,275	8,242	8,125
Employed	7,340	7,606	7,511	7,471	7,591	7,647	7,698	7,713	7,607
Unemployed	649	573	577	600	597	586	577	529	518
Unemployment rate	8.1	7.0	7.1	7.4	7.3	7.1	7.0	6.4	6.4
North Carolina									
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,539	4,621	4,628	4,539	4,593	4,608	4,614	4,621	4,628
Civilian labor force	(3)	2,999	3,022	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	3,076	3,063
Employed	(3)	2,786	2,820	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	2,868	2,878
Unemployed	(3)	213	201	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	208	185
Unemployment rate	(3)	7.1	6.7	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	6.8	6.0
Ohio									
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,063	8,072	8,073	8,063	8,067	8,067	8,070	8,072	8,073
Civilian labor force	4,922	5,022	5,001	5,081	5,137	5,107	5,151	5,130	5,162
Employed	4,423	4,568	4,536	4,598	4,655	4,657	4,694	4,697	4,711
Unemployed	499	454	465	483	482	450	457	433	451
Unemployment rate	10.1	9.0	9.3	9.5	9.4	8.8	8.9	8.4	8.7
Pennsylvania									
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,194	9,230	9,231	9,194	9,221	9,224	9,227	9,230	9,231
Civilian labor force	5,343	5,414	5,384	5,428	5,497	5,509	5,533	5,500	5,470
Employed	4,757	4,946	4,881	4,892	5,011	5,037	5,110	5,074	5,023
Unemployed	586	468	503	536	486	472	423	426	447
Unemployment rate	11.0	8.6	9.3	9.9	8.8	8.6	7.6	7.7	8.2
Texas									
Civilian noninstitutional population	11,393	11,520	11,530	11,393	11,484	11,496	11,509	11,520	11,531
Civilian labor force	7,582	7,733	7,811	7,621	[illegible]	7,883	7,917	7,822	7,880
Employed	7,115	7,219	7,274	7,197	7,418	7,431	7,441	7,314	7,339
Unemployed	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	419	451	452	476	508	541
Unemployment rate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	5.5	[illegible]	5.7	6.0	6.5	6.9

These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates used in the administration of Federal fund allocation programs.

[2] The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and the seasonally adjusted columns.

[3] Official estimates for North Carolina prior to 1985 are not derived from the household survey. Consequently, seasonally adjusted data are not published. The unadjusted estimates are available upon request.

Table B-1. Employees on nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(In thousands)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985 p	Feb. 1985 p	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985 p	Feb. 1985 p
Total	91,812	96,308	94,575	94,799	92,846	95,457	95,497	95,681	95,993	96,312
Total private	75,677	80,029	78,543	78,497	76,971	79,354	79,371	79,618	79,957	80,272
Goods producing	23,919	25,149	24,686	24,508	24,577	25,080	25,121	25,258	25,312	25,195
Mining	984	1,008	988	974	978	1,012	1,009	1,000	995	984
Oil and gas extraction	637.2	660.9	662.2	633.2	607	643	640	646	639	633
Construction	3,774	4,412	4,124	4,001	4,226	4,312	4,386	4,457	4,532	4,480
General building contractors	1,033.7	1,151.6	1,090.0	1,055.0	1,111	1,140	1,146	1,150	1,187	1,171
Manufacturing	19,161	19,717	19,574	19,529	19,373	19,686	19,738	19,801	19,805	19,721
Production workers	13,163	13,506	13,367	13,339	13,326	13,497	13,505	13,571	13,575	13,503
Durable goods	11,319	11,735	11,713	11,678	11,460	11,752	11,776	11,836	11,840	11,785
Production workers	7,638	7,928	7,853	7,824	7,718	7,915	7,925	7,969	7,966	7,905
Lumber and wood products	675.9	678.6	684.1	677.8	706	713	713	717	716	707
Furniture and fixtures	479.9	498.3	495.8	497.7	480	487	492	495	497	493
Stone, clay, and glass products	576.3	602.5	586.6	580.0	604	606	606	612	613	604
Primary metal industries	873.2	869.1	855.6	856.6	877	866	865	859	860	858
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	343.9	333.2	335.2	336.5	348	320	320	318	318	319
Fabricated metal products	1,414.7	1,500.3	1,487.5	1,480.1	1,407	1,495	1,498	1,502	1,499	1,491
Machinery, except electrical	2,155.7	2,257.1	2,241.8	2,238.5	2,151	2,255	2,251	2,253	2,248	2,236
Electrical and electronic equipment	2,168.3	2,281.3	2,272.5	2,268.7	2,175	2,259	2,278	2,281	2,282	2,280
Transportation equipment	1,836.8	1,998.9	1,965.2	1,979.9	1,898	1,945	1,957	1,991	2,009	1,992
Motor vehicles and equipment	852.1	896.3	884.9	873.2	865	865	877	906	911	885
Instruments and related products	711.3	732.7	730.3	730.9	715	729	731	732	732	735
Miscellaneous manufacturing	379.5	396.8	371.6	369.8	387	390	389	390	386	374
Nondurable goods	7,842	7,982	7,861	7,851	7,913	7,934	7,962	7,965	7,965	7,936
Production workers	5,525	5,578	5,514	5,515	5,608	5,582	5,580	5,602	5,609	5,598
Food and kindred products	1,578.5	1,642.6	1,608.5	1,595.4	1,637	1,640	1,644	1,658	1,660	1,653
Tobacco manufactures	68.7	72.0	71.8	70.3	65	69	67	69	70	71
Textile mill products	752.2	729.3	721.7	715.4	767	735	731	727	724	720
Apparel and other textile products	1,229.7	1,176.3	1,166.4	1,172.2	1,213	1,178	1,174	1,186	1,165	1,175
Paper and allied products	674.3	684.3	680.7	680.8	680	684	683	688	685	686
Printing and publishing	1,333.3	1,398.1	1,388.5	1,391.1	1,333	1,383	1,384	1,386	1,389	1,391
Chemicals and allied products	1,049.4	1,058.1	1,056.3	1,056.0	1,058	1,065	1,066	1,068	1,064	1,063
Petroleum and coal products	186.1	182.3	180.1	179.2	190	185	185	184	183	181
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	777.1	807.3	803.3	806.3	784	805	810	814	813	818
Leather and leather products	207.0	199.3	186.1	184.7	210	193	192	191	187	184
Service producing	67,893	71,159	69,889	70,291	68,269	70,377	70,376	70,423	70,681	70,916
Transportation and public utilities	5,031	5,276	5,181	5,187	5,105	5,225	5,226	5,249	5,257	5,268
Transportation	2,768	3,001	2,910	2,917	2,828	2,951	2,953	2,974	2,972	2,980
Communication and public utilities	2,263	2,275	2,271	2,270	2,276	2,274	2,273	2,275	2,285	2,288
Wholesale trade	5,389	5,648	5,626	5,634	5,438	5,512	5,623	5,641	5,669	5,686
Durable goods	3,171	3,325	3,326	3,335	3,193	3,201	3,317	3,328	3,343	3,359
Nondurable goods	2,218	2,323	2,300	2,299	2,245	2,311	2,306	2,313	2,326	2,327
Retail trade	15,317	17,239	16,457	16,318	15,983	16,469	16,644	16,626	16,708	16,805
General merchandise stores	2,140.2	2,652.8	2,424.8	2,320.0	2,211	2,314	2,381	2,331	2,363	2,393
Food stores	2,536.7	2,759.0	2,701.7	2,703.0	2,626	2,677	2,696	2,710	2,715	2,733
Automotive dealers and service stations	1,729.9	1,770.1	1,764.0	1,763.4	1,740	1,763	1,772	1,777	1,780	1,796
Eating and drinking places	4,964.6	5,289.3	5,088.5	5,117.3	5,121	5,290	5,303	5,327	5,356	5,387
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,566	5,737	5,723	5,736	5,593	5,705	5,725	5,749	5,760	5,790
Finance	2,808	2,895	2,899	2,910	2,812	2,865	2,874	2,886	2,899	2,922
Insurance	1,737	1,783	1,782	1,786	1,741	1,774	1,778	1,785	1,786	1,790
Real estate	1,035	1,059	1,042	1,040	1,040	1,066	1,073	1,078	1,075	1,078
Services	20,375	21,011	20,870	21,118	20,278	20,964	21,030	21,095	21,231	21,331
Business services	3,783.8	4,180.1	4,167.8	4,176.8	3,865	4,110	4,182	4,151	4,218	4,282
Health services	6,021.5	6,139.0	6,121.9	6,126.9	6,060	6,097	6,104	6,115	6,140	6,152
Government	16,135	16,279	16,032	16,302	15,875	16,103	16,126	16,063	16,036	16,040
Federal	2,746	2,798	2,772	2,788	2,763	2,793	2,808	2,809	2,798	2,805
State	3,770	3,785	3,671	3,776	3,682	3,719	3,728	3,711	3,701	3,684
Local	9,618	9,696	9,589	9,738	9,430	9,591	9,590	9,543	9,537	9,547

p = preliminary

r = revised

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[1] on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985 p	Feb. 1985 p	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985 p	Feb. 1985 p
Total private	35.0	35.5	34.9	34.7	35.3	35.1	35.2	35.3	35.2	35.3
Mining	42.9	44.2	42.9	42.6	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Construction	37.0	37.8	36.3	36.9	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing	40.7	41.2	40.3	39.7	40.9	40.6	40.5	40.7	40.6	40.0
Overtime hours	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.1	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.1
Durable goods	41.4	42.1	41.1	40.0	41.7	41.3	41.2	41.4	41.4	40.6
Overtime hours	3.6	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.3
Lumber and wood products	39.8	39.0	39.0	38.1	40.4	39.7	39.5	40.0	39.9	38.8
Furniture and fixtures	39.5	43.3	39.3	38.6	39.9	39.6	39.8	39.6	40.0	39.4
Stone, clay, and glass products	41.5	41.7	40.5	40.2	42.5	41.8	41.8	41.7	41.6	41.9
Primary metal industries	42.0	41.6	41.0	40.9	42.0	41.3	41.5	41.2	41.0	40.7
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	41.2	39.9	39.8	40.0	39.3	40.9	40.0	39.7	39.7	40.0
Fabricated metal products	41.5	42.2	41.1	40.5	41.8	41.3	41.9	41.4	41.3	40.9
Machinery, except electrical	41.9	42.8	41.7	41.0	41.9	41.9	41.7	41.8	41.7	41.0
Electrical and electronic equipment	41.1	41.4	40.8	40.1	41.2	40.9	41.5	41.3	40.9	40.2
Transportation equipment	42.9	43.3	43.1	42.0	43.1	42.6	42.8	43.0	43.6	42.2
Motor vehicles and equipment	43.9	44.9	44.4	42.2	44.1	43.3	43.6	44.4	44.0	42.5
Instruments and related products	41.2	42.1	41.0	40.7	41.2	41.2	41.5	41.0	41.2	40.7
Miscellaneous manufacturing	38.8	39.5	38.8	38.7	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Nondurable goods	39.6	40.3	39.2	38.7	39.9	39.3	39.8	39.6	39.5	39.3
Overtime hours	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.8	3.3	2.9	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.8
Food and kindred products	39.9	41.3	39.5	38.9	39.7	39.6	39.7	40.1	39.8	39.1
Tobacco manufactures	36.8	39.8	37.2	37.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Textile mill products	40.8	39.6	38.8	38.4	40.0	39.7	39.0	39.2	39.1	38.6
Apparel and other textile products	35.7	35.4	35.6	35.2	36.9	35.3	36.0	36.0	36.1	35.4
Paper and allied products	42.9	43.0	42.5	42.0	43.2	43.0	43.2	43.1	43.1	42.3
Printing and publishing	37.6	39.0	37.8	37.3	37.9	37.4	37.9	37.7	37.8	37.6
Chemicals and allied products	42.3	42.8	41.9	41.5	42.1	41.6	41.7	41.9	42.0	41.5
Petroleum and coal products	43.5	42.9	43.2	42.7	44.5	43.5	43.5	42.9	43.8	41.7
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	42.0	42.0	41.3	40.4	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Leather and leather products	37.8	37.1	36.2	36.4	37.2	36.4	36.4	36.9	36.0	36.9
Transportation and public utilities	39.0	39.3	39.1	39.2	39.4	39.7	39.8	39.2	39.4	39.5
Wholesale trade	38.2	39.2	38.4	38.1	38.5	38.6	38.6	38.6	38.6	38.6
Retail trade	29.4	31.5	29.3	29.2	30.0	29.9	29.9	30.1	30.0	29.8
Finance, insurance, and real estate	36.4	36.7	36.5	36.5	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Services	32.4	32.8	32.5	32.6	32.7	32.7	32.7	32.8	32.7	32.8

---

[1] Data relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; to construction workers in construction; and to nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real estate; and services. These groups account for approximately four-fifths of the total employees on private nonagricultural payrolls.

[2] This series is not published seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.

p = preliminary

Table B-3. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers¹ on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

Industry	Average hourly earnings				Average weekly earnings			
	Feb. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985 p	Feb. 1985 p	Feb. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985 p	Feb. 1985 p
Total private	$8.24	$8.46	$8.50	$8.51	$288.40	$300.33	$296.65	$295.30
Seasonally adjusted	8.23	8.47	8.49	8.49	293.52	298.99	297.44	297.15
Mining	11.41	11.64	11.77	11.78	492.92	514.49	504.93	501.81
Construction	11.93	12.17	12.20	12.23	441.63	457.59	452.06	441.50
Manufacturing	9.05	9.30	9.42	9.42	360.78	388.46	379.63	373.07
Durable goods	9.61	9.94	9.97	9.97	390.69	418.47	409.77	402.79
Lumber and wood products	7.80	8.04	8.05	8.07	311.62	319.99	312.34	307.47
Furniture and fixtures	6.75	7.01	7.08	7.08	261.91	288.61	276.67	271.78
Stone, clay, and glass products	9.19	9.67	9.69	9.71	389.27	401.28	392.45	391.15
Primary metal industries	11.49	11.88	11.52	11.62	482.50	475.90	472.32	472.91
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	13.10	12.95	13.10	13.10	534.72	536.71	518.76	532.00
Fabricated metal products	9.18	9.55	9.57	9.60	380.17	403.01	393.33	388.40
Machinery, except electrical	9.87	10.16	10.12	10.12	411.55	438.85	422.00	418.92
Electrical and electronic equipment	8.86	9.27	9.29	9.30	360.15	387.83	379.01	372.93
Transportation equipment	12.03	12.59	12.62	12.53	514.93	552.70	543.92	526.26
Motor vehicles and equipment	12.61	13.21	13.12	13.17	560.40	593.11	591.81	555.27
Instruments and related products	8.86	8.99	8.95	9.06	355.73	368.20	366.95	368.74
Miscellaneous manufacturing	6.97	7.12	7.21	7.24	275.31	284.39	279.75	279.41
Nondurable goods	8.28	8.55	8.64	8.68	326.13	341.15	337.92	332.82
Food and kindred products	8.17	8.40	8.48	8.50	327.27	343.44	338.96	330.65
Tobacco manufactures	11.13	10.97	11.15	11.33	405.13	425.64	414.78	421.49
Textile mill products	6.40	6.57	6.59	6.60	250.88	258.86	255.69	253.44
Apparel and other textile products	5.46	5.65	5.71	5.69	200.14	205.86	203.28	200.29
Paper and allied products	10.27	10.69	10.68	10.71	436.48	460.22	458.17	450.46
Printing and publishing	9.30	9.56	9.57	9.59	349.68	367.13	357.92	353.71
Chemicals and allied products	10.93	11.17	11.41	11.40	457.93	482.01	478.92	471.10
Petroleum and coal products	13.41	13.61	13.90	13.86	584.27	580.73	600.48	591.82
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	8.16	8.43	8.50	8.49	342.72	356.06	351.05	343.00
Leather and leather products	5.67	5.80	5.83	5.82	219.45	215.10	211.05	211.85
Transportation and public utilities	11.01	11.12	11.33	11.32	428.33	447.18	441.00	443.78
Wholesale trade	8.79	9.10	9.15	9.17	335.78	357.10	351.36	351.21
Retail trade	5.80	5.89	5.97	5.99	171.17	180.21	174.32	170.91
Finance, insurance, and real estate	7.58	7.70	7.78	7.83	276.45	285.51	283.97	285.83
Services	7.55	7.82	7.82	7.86	245.11	256.50	256.15	256.24

See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary

Table B-4. Hourly Earnings Index for production or nonsupervisory workers¹ on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted					Seasonally adjusted						
	Feb. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985p	Feb. 1985p	Percent change from: Feb. 1984- Feb. 1985	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985p	Feb. 1985p	Percent change from: Jan. 1985- Feb. 1985
Total private nonfarm												
Current dollars	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	3.1	[illegible]	161.1	162.0	161.1	162.4	163.7	[illegible]
Constant (1977) dollars	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(2)	94.8	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	N.A.	(3)
Mining	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Construction	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Manufacturing	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Transportation and public utilities	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Wholesale trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Retail trade	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
Finance, insurance, and real estate	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
Services	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]

1 See footnote 1, table B-2.
2 Percent change is [illegible] percent from January 1984 to January 1985, the latest month available.
3 Percent change is [illegible] percent from December 1984 to January 1985, the latest month available.
4 This series is not seasonally adjusted since the seasonal component is small relative to the trend-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision.
N.A. = not available.
p = preliminary.

Table B-5. Indexes of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers¹ on private nonagricultural payrolls by industry

(1977 = 100)

Industry	Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
	Feb. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985 p	Feb. 1985 p	Feb. 1984	Oct. 1984	Nov. 1984	Dec. 1984	Jan. 1985 p	Feb. 1985 p
Total	107.6	116.1	111.2	110.6	110.9	113.2	114.0	114.6	114.8	114.6
Goods producing	96.8	101.6	96.6	94.5	99.2	99.7	100.2	100.9	101.1	99.0
Mining	109.7	117.9	112.6	110.0	112.1	115.8	117.1	116.5	112.7	112.5
Construction	95.9	117.0	103.7	98.0	114.1	116.2	118.1	118.7	121.1	118.0
Manufacturing	93.9	97.6	94.5	92.9	95.7	95.7	95.9	96.8	96.7	94.6
Durable goods	92.9	98.0	94.8	92.9	94.6	95.9	95.9	96.9	96.8	94.3
Lumber and wood products	91.6	94.6	90.3	87.5	97.6	96.2	95.9	97.8	97.7	92.8
Furniture and fixtures	100.7	109.0	104.9	103.6	102.8	103.1	105.5	105.5	108.2	106.0
Stone, clay, and glass products	82.6	87.5	82.1	80.5	89.3	88.2	88.6	89.1	89.1	86.9
Primary metal industries	73.3	70.3	70.0	69.5	73.5	71.6	71.6	70.7	70.6	69.7
Blast furnaces and basic steel products	62.5	56.6	56.6	55.9	62.6	56.3	57.3	55.3	55.3	55.9
Fabricated metal products	89.0	95.5	92.0	90.2	90.6	92.8	92.8	93.8	93.6	91.6
Machinery, except electrical	92.7	99.8	96.6	94.7	92.5	97.9	96.9	97.6	96.6	94.5
Electrical and electronic equipment	110.6	116.9	113.5	111.1	111.2	114.7	115.0	114.9	114.3	112.1
Transportation equipment	95.0	101.7	99.5	96.6	95.9	95.8	96.1	99.9	101.7	97.2
Motor vehicles and equipment	89.6	96.7	93.9	88.0	92.3	88.6	89.7	97.0	99.0	90.7
Instruments and related products	107.9	112.9	108.8	107.9	108.8	109.3	110.7	111.2	109.6	108.5
Miscellaneous manufacturing	83.5	86.0	79.6	79.4	86.5	86.3	85.8	86.2	84.7	82.4
Nondurable goods	95.3	97.0	94.1	92.9	97.5	95.5	95.8	96.6	96.6	95.1
Food and kindred products	90.9	99.5	96.6	92.1	96.9	97.0	97.5	99.6	99.2	98.5
Tobacco manufactures	81.2	99.3	96.8	91.8	86.1	95.6	92.6	93.0	92.6	97.1
Textile mill products	83.8	77.5	75.6	74.0	84.8	76.7	76.7	76.8	76.8	74.9
Apparel and other textile products	93.8	89.9	87.3	86.8	94.6	89.0	89.2	90.9	90.0	87.6
Paper and allied products	97.8	101.3	98.9	97.3	99.6	99.5	99.8	99.9	100.3	98.8
Printing and publishing	113.3	121.2	117.6	117.6	116.1	118.2	118.9	118.0	118.8	118.5
Chemicals and allied products	95.6	96.7	96.9	93.9	96.3	95.5	95.6	95.8	95.7	94.5
Petroleum and coal products	83.5	82.2	82.7	82.8	88.8	85.3	85.3	83.6	86.7	88.0
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	111.1	115.2	112.3	110.6	112.5	112.9	116.5	114.9	116.6	112.1
Leather and leather products	78.9	71.9	68.3	69.0	81.2	72.2	71.8	72.3	71.2	71.2
Service producing	116.3	124.2	119.3	119.5	117.6	120.7	121.6	122.1	122.3	122.9
Transportation and public utilities	100.7	107.4	106.3	106.5	103.1	105.2	106.1	106.1	106.6	107.0
Wholesale trade	110.0	117.9	115.8	115.5	112.0	116.2	116.3	116.8	117.6	117.7
Retail trade	103.8	120.6	109.8	108.3	109.6	111.8	113.6	114.1	114.2	114.1
Finance, insurance, and real estate	120.8	126.1	126.7	125.0	122.1	125.1	125.6	126.6	125.8	126.2
Services	128.0	135.0	132.8	136.6	129.9	136.2	134.8	135.6	135.7	136.9

¹ See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table B-6. Indexes of diffusion: Percent of industries in which employment¹ increased

Time span	Year	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Over 1-month span	1983..........	56.3	46.5	60.8	68.9	69.5	64.8	76.3	68.6	69.5	75.4	69.7	73.8
	1984..........	71.1	73.2	67.0	63.8	64.1	63.0	62.4	57.6	40.8	65.7	51.9	63.5
	1985..........	56.8p	47.3p										
Over 3-month span	1983..........	46.8	57.3	64.1	75.1	75.7	77.8	76.1	81.6	80.8	78.9	79.5	77.6
	1984..........	82.4	80.5	76.5	71.1	68.4	68.9	63.5	58.1	58.6	53.5	64.9	58.6p
	1985..........	57.3p											
Over 6-month span	1983..........	50.8	63.0	69.2	71.1	80.0	82.4	84.1	82.4	84.6	85.9	86.8	83.8
	1984..........	81.9	82.7	79.7	75.4	69.2	63.2	62.4	62.7	63.5	60.3p	52.2p	
	1985..........												
Over 12-month span	1983..........	69.5	54.3	61.9	71.1	77.3	79.5	83.8	88.1	86.8	87.3	85.4	87.3
	1984..........	86.5	81.9	78.9	76.8	76.3	73.8	71.9p	62.4p				
	1985..........												

¹ Number of employees, seasonally adjusted for 1, 3 and 6-month spans, on payrolls of 185 private nonagricultural industries.

p = preliminary.

NOTE: Figures are the percent of industries with employment rising. (Half of the unchanged components are counted as rising.) Data are centered within the spans.

Representative OBEY. Thank you, Ms. Norwood.

Ms. Norwood, before I get into these numbers this morning, I'd like to bring up another subject, and that is the issue of your own budget. Frankly, I see a number of things in it that disturb me quite a bit.

My understanding is that the budget for your shop contains the following: A cutback in funding for the Monthly Labor Review; a reduction in the household survey; a rescission of the mass layoff report just mandated by the Congress and my other committee, the Appropriations Committee; a cut in funds available for improving the data of the services component of the economy, which is the one providing the largest increase in employment these days; and most seriously, a transfer of 17 positions in the area of personnel management from you to direct control of the Assistant Secretary for Management, which is a political appointee.

I would like to ask you a series of questions and I understand that you have to defend the administration's position, but I am asking for your best professional judgment—on a number of these issues.

Let me ask you first: Were any of those changes proposed by your Bureau, or suggested to the Department or the White House by your Bureau in the preparation of the 1986 budget?

Ms. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, as you're well aware, the budget goes through a whole series of iterations. I do want you to know that the final decisions about particular programs—that is, whether to take cuts in one program or another—were determined by me.

Representative OBEY. Did you initially ask for those changes?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I don't think many managers spend time trying to find things to reduce, but we all are quite aware of the fact that we have a deficit and that we've got to try to find ways to cut back.

Representative OBEY. I understand the rules, but the answer is that you did not initially request any of those changes?

Ms. NORWOOD. I'd rather pass on that.

Representative OBEY. Did you initially request transfer of the 17 positions to the Labor Department from your shop?

Ms. NORWOOD. No, sir, I did not. That's a somewhat different issue and I would like to state my position on it.

The fiscal 1986 budget of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the development of a governmentwide initiative, provides for increased efficiencies in administration of programs for a reduction, in our case, of six positions and $240,000 in the personnel function, and the transfer of the remaining positions to the Department of Labor.

I support the reduction of the six positions and $240,000. I have grave concerns, however, about the wisdom of the transfer of personnel authority for a statistical agency to the Department. We, in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have a long history. If you go back 10, 15 years, this very committee held hearings that were related to personnel shifts.

I have expressed those concerns to Under Secretary Ford and I expressed them to the Senate Appropriations Committee at the hearing that we had.

This is not an issue of personalities. I want to underscore the fact that no one has been more supportive of the integrity of the Bureau than Secretary Donovan and Under Secretary Ford.

In this 101st year of the Bureau I am very concerned about where the Bureau will be 100 years from now, and I think we need to look at this in terms of the principle of how statistical agencies are handled.

Representative OBEY. I agree with that.

Let me ask in terms of your budget reductions first before I turn to that point.

Can you tell us that these reductions will provide in any way for an improvement in the quality of the statistics that you provide the Congress or the business community or others who study the economy from month to month?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, Congressman, I think it is important to recognize that the BLS budget does continue to provide for some very important improvements.

We will be continuing to complete the redesign of the current population survey.

We will be continuing the modernization of our business establishment program, and we will be continuing the very important CPR revision program.

So there are instances and very important areas where we will be building up.

In the case of statistics on the services sector which you mentioned, there is, you are quite right, a cut, but there still remain some 20 positions and about $1 million, which we intend to use particularly to look at some of the service sector issues in the wage area, where I think there is a great deal that we don't know very much about, and we would like very much to expand our employment cost index, and there are funds to do that in the budget. We also will be doing some work in prices and some work in productivity.

Representative OBEY. What is your estimate of the total amount of savings that would be achieved by these reductions?

Ms. NORWOOD. There is about $750,000 removed from services. There is a cut for the dissemination of information of the Bureau in our information services in the field as well as in our printing budget. Our printing budget including the Monthly Labor Review has been cut severely, and that amounts to $400,000 perhaps or $500,000.

And we have had perhaps about $12 million of cuts and then some increases. It is a strange kind of budget. You have to look at both sides of it.

Representative OBEY. I agree.

Let me just point out that if you are cutting back funding for the Monthly Labor Review, if you are cutting into the household survey operations, if you are reducing the funds available for improving the data in the service-related economy, my understanding is that those total reductions come to somewhat less than $5 million.

Ms. NORWOOD. That is a lot of money for us.

Representative OBEY. I understand, and my concern is that the numbers that your shop produces are used to distribute a whole lot more money around the country on the basis, we hope, of accurate estimates of situations around the country; just for the Job Training Partnership Act, $1.9 billion, for instance.

So I would hope that we would see fit not to weaken in any way the accuracy of numbers used to distribute an amount of money that large.

Let me just say on the other subject that you raised, I regard the effort to transfer those 17 positions to the Labor Department as being at least potentially a serious threat to the longstanding tradition of your agency to maintain absolute objective independence and to be able to continue to call the numbers exactly as you see them rather than how politicians on either side of the political aisle might like to see them or shape them from time to time.

I just want to say for the record that I think it would be a severe impact on the public interest if we were to support that transfer.

If you take a look at the kind of job that has been done in your Bureau versus the kind of job that has been done in the Labor Department lately, I would suggest that there is quite a difference.

At this point, we do not have a confirmed Secretary who is on the job. We had for nearly 6 months a chief of staff who would not show up for work, and when I requested a report from the Department as to whether or not he was on leave, they refused to respond and the inspector general refused to provide me with a copy of the report that they prepared on that situation.

We have had a state of total chaos in the Labor Department, and now we are asked in the budget to move some of your people into one of the most chaotic departments in the Federal Government at this point. Frankly, I think it would be outrageous and a significant threat to the independence of your information, long term, were we to provide that.

I just want to make it clear, in my other capacity as a member of the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, that I don't intend in any way to support that transfer. I think it would be outrageous if it were to occur.

Let me turn it over now to other members. Congressman Lungren.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I know, Commissioner Norwood, that we all are looking month to month at these statistics to try to discern what they mean. I know a number of us have been concerned that with the rapid progress we made in terms of the unemployment rate that we have been on a plateau for some period of time. I would like to at least try and look into that a little bit.

As I understand it, the labor force growth in 1984 increased less than 2 percent, and in December and January, combined this year, the labor force rose by 800,000. It appears to me that this is a fairly large increase. Is there any particular reason we can divine out of the figures for that?

Ms. NORWOOD. I think what we are seeing is a pickup in labor force growth. I think we had a slowdown, of course, during the recession period. Labor force growth is picking up.

Women are again coming into the labor market. Particularly younger women are coming into the labor market in large numbers. Their labor force participation rates are above 70 percent.

That is extraordinarily high. I think it is going to continue, too; they are going to continue to be there and to increase in number.

We have had, of course, fewer young people, fewer teenagers because of lower birth rates. So there are fewer people growing up.

But during the course of the recovery, we have had really close to 4 percent labor force growth. That is pretty good, quite a lot.

Representative LUNGREN. Should we expect that what we have seen in the last couple of months will continue? Isn't this a little faster than the rate that we had for all of last year, on an average?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, I think, as you know, Congressman Lungren, labor force growth tends to occur in spurts. We get a couple of months of high growth, and then we get a couple of months of flatness.

But I think that it is quite clear, to me at least, that we are going to have continuing increases in the labor force, particularly among women and minorities, which is going to make it more difficult to bring down the unemployment rate.

Representative LUNGREN. As I reviewed the data, it appeared that the labor force participation rate for adult men at least had been trending downward since the mid-1960's, at least until most recently.

How would you interpret current trends?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, they seem to be coming along at about 78.2 or 78.3 percent and they have been holding pretty steady at that rate for some time. You are right, that is somewhat different from the long-term trend that has been kind of coming downward. That may pick up again as people retire somewhat earlier. But right now I think we are having a lot of people coming back into the labor force who had left the labor force during the period of recession.

Representative LUNGREN. So I guess what you are telling me is that both for men and women we are seeing higher participation rates which, in terms of numbers of unemployment and employment, give us new challenges. I mean, those are slightly different trends, to say the least, from what they were in the last decade, are they not?

Ms. NORWOOD. Well, they are different trends, certainly, from the early 1980's, when we had people react to the recession by leaving the labor force. They aren't going to go out looking for jobs if they don't think there are any jobs around.

In the 1970's we had people coming into the labor force in very large numbers. We are not yet at that sizable an increase, but I think during the 27 months of the recovery there has been a decided change, and you are quite right that that means that we have to create even more jobs in order to reduce the unemployment rate because there are more and more people who are coming into the labor force looking for work.

Representative LUNGREN. If we can go to one of the points that you made about the distinction between the service sector of the economy and the manufacturing sector. You indicated that we saw a loss of jobs in the manufacturing sector, of which I think you said 25,000 were in the auto industry——

Ms. NORWOOD. Yes.

Representative **Lungren** [continuing]. And at the same time you indicated the increase that we had in employment in the auto industry over the period of recovery.

Is there some reason for this that comes to mind? Was this specifically in those areas of the auto industry that were affected by weather, or is there anything that we really can tell at this point from 1 month's statistics for that drop in the automobile industry?

Ms. **Norwood**. Auto sales are still quite high. The automobile industry toward the end of the year, the last months of 1984, deliberately for business reasons built up its inventory, and I think we shouldn't place too much emphasis, therefore, on this 1 month. The auto industry has, as I said, regained a considerable amount—in fact, it is way above the level that it was at during the trough of the recession.

I am much more concerned about some of the other manufacturing industries which I think are being very much affected by the restructuring that is occurring, for example, steel, textiles, and leather. Many of them are industries where they have fewer employees than they did at the trough of the recession.

So there is a very real change going on within the manufacturing sector.

Representative **Lungren**. Now, we have seen that the service producing sector is growing faster, obviously, than the manufacturing sector, and some critics—or some observers point to fast food type jobs as being the typical service sector employment that we are talking about.

In 1984, can you tell us, was the fastest rate of job growth in the service sector in the so-called menial jobs, as someone described them, or in managerial or professional specialty occupations?

Ms. **Norwood**. Over the past year, the fastest rate of growth has been in services, which includes hotels and auto repair as well as the very sophisticated business services. Growth has also been rapid in retail trade, which includes general merchandise stores and eating and drinking establishments.

There is a lot of discussion about whether we in the United States are in fact losing good jobs and replacing them with poor jobs.

I don't think that there is any definitive evidence on that yet.

In fact, that is one of the reasons that we are planning to move as rapidly as we can to expand our employment cost index to provide more information on compensation in the service-producing sector by occupation because I think it is that kind of data that is really needed in order to answer this question.

I would point out that when you look at the restructuring of the manufacturing sector, we ought to recognize that, while it is true that we are losing many of the high paying jobs in, say, the steel industry, we are also losing many of the low paying jobs in, say, leather and shoes.

So I don't think we should jump to the conclusion that all of the jobs are going to be low paying jobs.

Representative **Lungren**. I guess what prompted my question was in the Monthly Labor Review for February there was an article discussing total employment. The highest percent positive change was in the managerial professional specialty area, 5.1 percent. There was a note after the graph which said that the administrative support subsector, which includes clerical workers, grew by about 2 percent over the year. I was just trying to see whether there is anything we can draw out of that. That would seem to run counter to the initial thought that many have that the service side is predominantly fast food and only that.

Ms. **Norwood**. You are quite right that it is not just that and only that. I am familiar with that article but you know, I would point out that, for example, in the managerial and professional specialty we have physicians and we have nurses, and that they are very different kinds of jobs with very different kinds of pay. So one really needs to get very deeply into disaggregated data.

My view is that we don't yet have the kind of information that is needed in order to evaluate that. I have looked at the work that has been done. Some work has been done by people in Boston and elsewhere. I am not at all sure that that is definitive enough.

And I am not convinced that this is really a serious problem for us because it is clear that there is a shift going on in occupational employment. We are losing blue collar jobs, and we are gaining white collar jobs, and many of the white collar jobs—many of them, not all of them—but many of those white collar jobs are jobs which require a good deal of skill and background and have relatively high rates of pay.

In addition, I would expect that we would be seeing in the coming year or so greater increases in remuneration in the service-producing sector than in the goods-producing sector just because of the employment conditions there, supply and demand.

Representative **Lungren**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative **Obey**. Congressman Hawkins.

Representative **Hawkins**. Ms. Norwood, I've always been concerned that we seem to know so little about many things and seem to concentrate on what we do know about a few things.

The situation is that each month we discuss these changes, many of which are practically only a small fraction, one-tenth of a percentage point. We seem to be rather precise about it and yet the variables that we're dealing with are very imprecise and we know so little about them. And I view with some concern this loss of personnel in the agency because it may mean that we will be a little more ignorant in the future than what we are now.

Ms. **Norwood**. I hope not.

Representative **Hawkins**. Well, maybe you will not be but I am afraid the public may find itself in a very embarrassing situation of not knowing very much about it, which leads me into what I really wanted to explore with you, and that is more precise reporting of what goes on in the labor market.

For example, we have no definition, it seems, of a job. A job is a job if it's 1 hour or 1 week or if it's full time. Whether it's at the minimum or below the minimum wage or whether it is in a very high bracket. And yet it's classified as a job which really doesn't give us very much to go on in terms of formulating policy or determining programs at all.

And we invariably look at the monthly unemployment rate which you bring to us. And yet that unemployment rate, somehow, does not give the severity, the extent, the duration, of unemployment. So we don't know how many people are out there suffering. We seem to ignore it and if it goes up a fraction everybody rushes to say, well, we don't need job programs, we don't need to do anything. The economy is producing these jobs. And if it goes down for political reasons we tend to ignore it and say, oh, it's only a temporary situation.

And, yet, we are now stuck on a plateau in the 7-percent range. With the exception, maybe, of Canada and the United Kingdom, no other industrialized nation would tolerate that. And I think it's because we seem to think that 8.5 million people are unemployed, we give the impression that most of them are frictionally unemployed people who are just moving from one job to the other, or new people—kids coming into the labor market who really don't need the job, and so forth. And for that reason we should cut back on student assistance because we think everything is going along merrily and we go along with it.

It seems to me if we had some method of doing it—and with your reduced budget I don't know whether or not I'm even being practical—rather than merely discussing the official rate each month, that we could in some way, discuss the actual number of unemployed people.

For example, you mask in a narrative manner, the number of individuals employed part time. Well, we don't know how many of those people are employed part time for economic reasons, how much they really are unemployed. We count them as employed and we don't know how much unemployment is masked by simply aggregating that number. We talk about the discouraged and yet we don't—we count them but we don't include them anyplace. We know they have dropped out of the labor market.

Every year we know that almost 1 million young people drop out of school, age 15. We used to count them, now we ignore them. We know they've dropped out of school. We count them as if they're still in school, where, if they're out there, they're either looking for jobs or they're raising hell. And some of them are becoming criminals. And yet we don't even statistically give any—make any notice of these factors.

There are a lot of factors, it seems to me, that we should be concerned about but because we religiously look at the official unemployment, we take it as something more than just a trend, and we don't include the other factors.

I'm not trying to blame you, obviously. What I'm saying is that, do you believe that it would be possible to develop an index that might reflect these other factors to give some weight to the quality of a job, at least those that we count, to include them in a rate?

Now, whether it is in addition to the official rate, I'm not very much concerned about that. I don't think through my suggestion we're going to get rid of this fiction but, nevertheless, for some of us who are dealing with problems from day to day and actually legislating on the basis of statistics that come from your office, it seems to me that we are uninformed and we cannot, as a result of that, carry on a constructive dialogue with other Members of Congress who don't, let's say, sit in on these hearings each month and don't sit in on some of the appropriate committee hearings, where these things are being discussed.

Ms. **Norwood**. Congressman Hawkins, I think there are several things that we are doing that answer some of the questions, but not all.

You talk about the quality of a job. That's an extraordinarily difficult thing to get at but we do have, in our wage data, a good bit of information about the conditions of work.

In terms of the employment status, we have 8.4 million people that were reported as unemployed in the month of February.

In my statement, I talked about the 5.3 million who told us that they were working, but that they were working part time for economic reasons.

Representative **Hawkins**. Have you any idea of the duration of the work—in other words, were they merely picked up because they worked, let's say, a few hours or were they, let's say, working more than half the average workweek or less? Do you have any possiblity of breaking it down?

Mr. **Bregger**. Their hours of that category tend to average about half of a full-time workweek. In other words, around 22 or 23 hours.

Ms. **Norwood**. On average.

Representative **Hawkins**. Would it be fair to say, then, that they might be counted as half unemployed or half employed, whichever way you want to do it? Or you could do it both ways?

Ms. **Norwood**. Well, one could do that and, in fact——

Representative **Hawkins**. Which is, in fact, the reality of the situation. If they're half employed; they're half unemployed.

Ms. **Norwood**. Well, in fact, I call your attention to table A-5 of the press release, which has seven different unemployment rates, starting with only those who are unemployed 15 weeks or more, that rate is, of course, quite low, in the 2-percent range, going up to what we call U-6 and U-7, which include some of these groups. And that, of course, brings the rate up almost to or into the double-digit range.

But we do have an unemployment rate which includes—in addition the people who are in the official rate—half of these people who are employed part time for economic reasons, and includes also the 1.3 million people who reported that they were not looking for work because they were too discouraged to look.

Representative **Hawkins**. How many people do you think know that that table exists?

Ms. **Norwood**. Well, we talk about it from time to time.

Representative **Hawkins**. Yes, but could it parallel the official unemployment rate since it's just as important as the official unemployment rate to include this rate as well as the other. Is it possible each month, as you now do to civilian plus the military, include two rates. Is it possible to include a rate which actually puts this out in bold release so that it—when it goes out with the other rate?

Ms. **Norwood**. Congressman Hawkins, we are not responsible for the way in which people write up the data or for that rate which makes the headlines.

We try—very carefully—to explain to all users of the data that you really need to disaggregate data, you need to look below the overall numbers—as you're pointing out—to find out what's really going on.

There are 8.4 million people who are unemployed. Not all of this 8.4 million people represent a serious national problem. Clearly, the people who've been unemployed for 6 months or more are in terrible trouble. That's about 1.3 million.

Certainly the 5 million plus people who want to work full time and can't find a full-time job, are in some difficulty. Our minority population which has extraordinarily high unemployment rates and very low employment population ratios, are in difficulty. Each of those groups is in difficulty, I believe, for different kinds of reasons.

And it is these individual groups that we try to point out to people in the executive branch and to those in the Congress who are interested and to reporters, when we discuss these issues with them. These are the kinds of groups that need to be looked at because you need to disaggregate to look at the particular problems that people have.

Many people in this country suffer a spell of unemployment that may be rather short lived. That may be certainly a matter of great difficulty for them but, nevertheless, does not mean that they are in the kind of terrible trouble that someone who's been unemployed for 6 months or a year is in.

Representative HAWKINS. Well, I disagree with you on only one thing, and that is that 8.5 million—and that is the lowest number that could be used, it should be 12 or 15, certainly—that number is a disgrace in a nation such as ours, and I would say that they are suffering and if even a million people are suffering out there in a nation such as ours, to me, that's a tragedy. And I think we cannot ignore them.

Those of us, you know, who are doing so much better than they are, cannot simply brush them off as if they're not suffering. And they're not suffering, in many instances, because of their own disabilities; they're suffering because of things that we do or don't do and I think that, to me, is a national tragedy.

Ms. NORWOOD. I would agree that one does need to look at each of these groups to see what the kinds of policy responses might be. The point I'm making is that the fact that we're reporting 8 million plus people unemployed does not mean that they all have the same kinds of problems. Some of them have serious problems and some of them have less serious problems.

Congressman Hawkins, I might also call your attention to the annual report that BLS puts out, linking unemployment to economic hardship.

We attempt to take the income data that we get from a supplement to the Current Population Survey once a year and relate it to many of these kinds of labor market conditions.

Representative HAWKINS. Thank you, Ms. Norwood. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Representative OBEY. Ms. Norwood, returning to your budget for one moment. As I think anybody understands, one of the easiest ways to take away potential arguments if you want to avoid them, is to take away from people who might want to argue with you, access to information.

I'll give you a little example from when the Appropriations Committee, on which I serve, finally decided to make our public hearings open, after the strange anomaly that for years our public hearings were closed.

The reason that those of us who were not chairmen in those days voted to make those hearings open was not because we cared about whether the press was there. I, frankly, couldn't have cared less.

My concern was that the only way we could get our own staff people into the room to help us with information being provided by the witnesses—and sometimes by our own chairmen—was to open up those hearings to the public.

My concern about your budget is that in some areas it does shrink the amount of information which is immediately available to people in analyzing what's going on in the economy.

For instance, to pursue a line of questioning with you on the nature of employment in the service economy—under your budget for this year, as I understand it, the Monthly Labor Review—which Congressman Lungren just referred to, would be shrunk from a monthly to a quarterly review.

Ms. Norwood. That's correct.

Representative Obey. I think things like that create—not an earthshaking problem, certainly, but an additional problem for people who want or need that information, on an up-to-date, timely basis that could be very important at a given stage of consideration of a number of policy decisions.

Let me pursue the line of questioning that was pursued by Congressman Lungren because, as you indicated, the growth portion of the economy in the main at this point seems to be service related rather than industrial.

Am I to take it from your responses to Congressman Lungren that we do not have sufficient information at this time, for instance, to give this committee, say, a comparison of the average wage of new jobs created in service sectors versus the average wage of jobs being lost in the manufacturing sector?

Ms. Norwood. We don't have sufficient information to do that by individual occupation and I think it needs to be done by occupation because the occupational structure is shifting.

We have averages of industries from our business survey but they include an average that Carroll Wright, our first Commissioner called a "vicious quotient." And at times it can be used that way.

I think what we need to do in the wage field is to look at occupational wage surveys. We are developing work in that area and we do intend, using resources that are included in the fiscal year 1986 budget, to increase the samples in the service-producing sector so that we will have better data there.

Representative Obey. Well, let me put it this way: I want to ask you right now to illustrate what I mean. I would like to ask you if you could provide for the committee as soon as possible, a comparison of the average wage of the new jobs created in the service sector versus the average wage of jobs being lost in the manufacturing sector.

Then what I would ask is, how long do you think it would be before you could provide us the additional information which you just mentioned so that neither Congressman Lungren nor I have to go on the basis of our gut instincts, rather than on the basis of cold, hard facts.

Ms. Norwood. The data available do not allow us to differentiate between new jobs and existing jobs. However, it should be noted that in February 1985 average hourly earnings in the private service-producing sector averaged $7.86, while hourly earnings in manufacturing averaged $9.42. We'll provide something for the record.

Representative Obey. Regarding part-time employment, which Congressman Hawkins mentioned, how many of the persons who have part-time jobs but are looking for full-time work are heads of households?

Ms. Norwood. I don't know. We are——

Representative Obey. Do you have the necessary tools to be able to find out?

Ms. Norwood. We can provide some information for the record but I would point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that we prefer to look at people who are husbands, who are wives, who are supporting families, females and males who are supporting families on their own, rather than to use the term "heads of household," which we have tried to discourage some years ago in this statistical system.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

PERSONS EMPLOYED PART TIME FOR ECONOMIC REASONS BY FAMILY RELATIONSHIP, ANNUAL AVERAGES, 1984

[Numbers in thousands]

Family relationship	Total employed	Part time for economic reasons	
		Total	As percent of total employed
Total [1]	79,488	3,334	4.2
Husbands	37,511	1,033	2.8
Wives	24,848	1,357	5.5
Women maintaining families	5,397	416	7.7
Men maintaining families	1,558	76	4.9
Primary individuals [2]	10,174	452	4.4
Men	5,306	232	4.4
Women	4,868	220	4.5

[1] Excludes relatives in families and persons living in group quarters.

[2] Persons living alone.

Representative Obey. What would their average family incomes be?

Ms. Norwood. We don't have any method to isolate that on an annual bases.

Representative Obey. Any ideas at all?

Ms. Norwood. No.

Representative Obey. OK.

On the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program, there were, as of January, 326,000 unemployed workers receiving benefits under that program.

Can you tell us during February how many workers were receiving benefits under the Federal Supplemental Compensation Program?

Ms. Norwood. The extended benefits or the supplemental? I have that here, just a minute.

[Pause.]

Ms. Norwood. I don't have the exact number. I can tell you which States are on or off, and that there were about 320,000 receiving all extended benefits in general as of the middle of February.

Representative Obey. Can you tell us how many weeks had the typical worker covered by that program been unemployed?

Ms. Norwood. No, sir.

Representative Obey. Why is that?

Ms. Norwood. That information is not available, in part because the unemployment insurance [UI] system is a system which has some administrative data but it is used to administer UI benefits to pay checks. It is not looked at in a statistical sense.

There is a body of information there which I believe could be used to track people through the system, but we are not now able to do that.

Representative Obey. Thank you.

How many people exhaust unemployment insurance benefits each month these days?

Ms. Norwood. We have some information coming from the Employment Training Administration of the Department showing that roughly a couple of hundred thousand a month have been exhausting regular benefits. We have figures showing basically that the number exhausting in December is about 189,000 from UI, and then about 82,000 from all extended benefits.

Representative Obey. What kind of information is available about what happens to workers and their families when they exhaust those UI benefits?

Ms. Norwood. We don't really know. They fall out of the system for tracking in UI once they have exhausted their benefits.

Representative Obey. Isn't that part of what the plant closing study is intended to examine?

Ms. Norwood. Yes, sir.

Representative Obey. Let me ask you questions on farming, and I really have no idea what the answers would be on this.

As you know, it's ironic because a lot of people coming to town here lately are talking about the problems of the farmers, are coming from States, with a couple of exceptions, that have fairly low unemployment rates in comparison to the rest of the country.

I just have a specific technical question. At what point would a farmer who is in the process of losing his farm be counted as unemployed?

Ms. Norwood. If he were in the sample, and there certainly are farmers who are included in the sample for the current population survey, at the time that he said that he was not working at all during the survey week, and that he was looking for work, he would be counted as unemployed.

Representative Obey. Are there any special gaps of information that we have about the labor market in farm areas? Are there any additional tools that we need to be able to have a more accurate understanding of what the situation is in that area of the economy in terms of employment?

Ms. **Norwood**. Well, as you know, Mr. Chairman, data——

Representative **Obey**. Here's what I'm getting at. If you are a young person, for instance, and you go in and you look for a job in my hometown, Wausau, 35,000, you're counted. If you're a young person who is from a farm family, you know, you may work at home and you may not get counted. You may be looking for something else. It gets very squishy.

I guess, it's a whole different way of arriving at information. I guess my question is, given the different way that we treat the farm economy in measuring a lot of things, what do we really know about it in respect to this point?

Ms. **Norwood**. You should understand that our employment-unemployment system is based upon a whole set of definitions which are getting at whether people are working at all or not, not whether they are working at farm work, or whether they're working in the city nearby.

The Agricultural Department Statistical Reporting Service does have a good deal of information, but exactly what that is, I don't know. We could supply something for the record which we could get from them. I'd be glad to do that.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

Farm Labor

Crop Reporting Board
Statistical Reporting Service
United States Department of Agriculture
Washington, D.C. 20250

RELEASED: November 20, 1984
3:00 P.M. ET

NUMBER OF HIRED WORKERS DOWN - WAGES HIGHER

During the week of October 7 -13, 1984, 3.2 million people were working on farms and ranches in the United States, according to the Crop Reporting Board. This includes workers hired directly by the farm operators and agricultural services employees working on farms. This is down 20 percent (.8 million) from July and down 16 percent (.6 million) from October 1980, when the last comparable Farm Labor Survey was conducted. Hired workers represented 37 percent (1.2 million) of the total. Of these workers, 1.02 million were hired directly by the farm operators which was 29 and 22 percent fewer than in July 1984 and October 1980, respectively. Farm operators and other unpaid workers who worked 15 hours or more accounted for the remaining 2.0 million workers, 12 percent below July and 18 percent below October 1980.

The wage rates for all hired workers was $4.56 per hour, up 9.6 percent from July and up 18 percent from October 1980. The wage rate for workers paid on an hourly basis was $4.45, up 33 cents from July. In October 1980, .he wage rage for hourly paid workers was $3.81. Wage rates by categories of workers were: field $4.40, Livestock $4.12, and piece rate $5.32.

During the October 7 - 13, 1984 survey week, the self-employed farm operator worked an average of 43.1 hours, 5.1 hours less than in July, but 1.4 hours more than in October 1980. The unpaid workers on farms averaged 36.4 hours for the week, down 4.4 and 2.8 hours from July 1984 and October 1980, respectively. Hired workers averaged 40.2 hours, 3.4 hours more than in July and 0.1 hour more than in October 1980.

PERQUISITES AND OTHER BENEFITS

Approximately 49 percent of the hired workers received perquisites such as meals, housing or motor vehicle in addition to the cash wage in October 1984. About 14 percent of the hired workers were furnished a house in addition to the cash wages.

Requests for a subscription order form covering all available reports should be directed to Crop Reporting Board Publications, Room 5829 - South Building, USDA, Washington, D.C. 20250 (Phone (202) 447-4021).

SpSy 8 (11-84)

For Information Call: (202) 447-5446

FARM WORKERS AND WORKERS PER FARM

During the week of October 7 - 13, 1984, of the work force hired directly by farm operators, 42 percent were on farms where 11 or more hired workers were employed. Farms employing one hired worker accounted for 15 percent of the direct hired work force.

During the survey week, precipitation fell on nearly all of the western two-thirds of the Nation. Snow piled deep over the western Plateau and Mountains. Thunderstorms produced heavy downpours on the Southeastern Texas coast, from Eastern Oklahoma through Arkansas, to the Delta region and in much of Minnesota. Most of the East Coast States had little or no rain. Corn harvest was running 13 percent behind normal in the Corn Belt States. Cotton harvest was 11 percent behind normal while soybean combining was 15 percent behind normal. Sorghum and rice harvest was slightly behind normal.

SOURCE AND RELIABILITY OF ESTIMATES

The estimates of agricultural labor are based on multiple frame probability surveys. The surveys utilize two sampling frames -- a list frame of agricultural producers and an area frame. The list sample is a stratified random sample containing many employers likely to have large numbers of workers.

The area frame contains all land units in the Nation. A probability sample from the area frame would provide an unbiased estimate for agricultural workers on farms. However, the area frame is a less efficient sampling frame because a large number of workers are hired by a small proportion of farm operators. Therefore, the area frame is used to estimate for the incompleteness in the list. Thereby, the multiple frame sampling approach utilizes the desirable attributes of both frames.

Estimates based on a sample differ somewhat from data that would have been obtained if a complete enumeration had been taken. These differences result from sampling variability. In addition, survey estimates are subject to non-sampling errors. Enumerator training, questionnaire design and testing, and comprehensive edit procedures can minimize the number and severity of these non-sampling errors.

Standard errors and relative sampling errors are statistical measures of the variation that occurs by chance because of sampling of the population. Indications from the survey are expected to be within the range of one standard error below to one standard error above the true value in two out of three cases. At the U.S. level, the number of self-employed and other unpaid workers and the number of hired workers had relative sampling errors of 2.7 and 6.3 percent, respectively. Relative errors at the regional level for hired workers ranged from 8 to 26 percent. Wage rates for all hired workers in the 28 States where State estimates are published had relative errors between 1 and 16 percent.

FARM LABOR: EMPLOYMENT AND INDEXES, UNITED STATES, OCTOBER 1984, WITH COMPARISONS

ITEM	JUL 6-12, 1980	OCT 12-18, 1980	JUL 8-14, 1984 1/	OCT 7-13, 1984
	THOUSANDS			
FARM EMPLOYMENT				
TOTAL	4,542.6	3,791.4	3,750.0	3,059.0
SELF-EMPLOYED	3/	3/	1,487.4	1,467.0
UNPAID	3/	3/	827.6	567.0
HIRED	1,791.4	1,306.0	1,435.0	1,025.0
EXPECTED TO BE EMPLOYED				
150 DAYS OR MORE	3/	3/	678	652
149 DAYS OR LESS	3/	3/	757	373
AGRICULTURAL SERVICES WORKERS WORKING ON FARMS	67	67	326	190
	(1910-14=100) 2/			
INDEXES				
TOTAL	28	27	23	22
HIRED	33	34	26	26
	(1977=100) 2/			
TOTAL	92	91	75	73
HIRED	94	96	75	75

FARM WAGE RATES 4/ 5/

ITEM	JUL 6-12, 1980	OCT 12-18, 1980	JUL 8-14, 1984 1/	OCT 7-13, 1984
	DOLLARS PER HOUR			
ALL HIRED FARM WORKERS	3.54	3.85	4.16	4.56
METHOD OF PAY				
HOURLY	3.53	3.81	4.12	4.45
PIECE-RATE	4.18	5.16	4.60	5.32
OTHER	3/	3/	4.17	4.64
TYPE OF WORK PERFORMED				
COMBINED FIELD & LIVESTOCK	3.35	3.68	3.93	4.31
FIELD	3.38	3.82	3.93	4.40
LIVESTOCK	3.22	3.40	3.93	4.12
SUPERVISORY	5.45	5.79	6.28	6.62
OTHER	3/	3/	4.45	4.78
	(1910-14=100) 2/			
INDEXES				
ALL HIRED FARM WORKERS	2,456	2,416	2,886	2,862
	(1977=100) 2/			
ALL HIRED FARM WORKERS	129	127	152	150

1/ NO REVISIONS. 2/ SEASONALLY ADJUSTED. 3/ NOT AVAILABLE.
4/ PERQUISITES SUCH AS ROOM AND BOARD, HOUSING, ETC., ARE PROVIDED SOME WORKERS IN ALL CATEGORIES. 5/ EXCLUDES AGRICULTURAL SERVICE WORKERS.

HIRED WORKERS ON FARMS, UNITED STATES, OCTOBER 1984 WITH COMPARIONS 1/

NUMBER	JUL 8-14, 1984	OCT 7-13, 1984
	PERCENT	
1 WORKER	12	15
2 WORKERS	13	13
3-6 WORKERS	27	23
7-10 WORKERS	7	7
11 AND OVER WORKERS	41	42

HIRED WORKERS ON FARMS BY METHOD OF PAY, UNITED STATES, OCTOBER 1984 WITH COMPARISONS 1/

PAYMENT METHOD	JUL 8-14, 1984	OCT 7-13, 1984
	PERCENT	
HOURLY	73	71
PIECE-RATE	8	11
OTHER	19	18

HIRED WORKERS ON FARMS RECEIVING PERQUISITES, UNITED STATES, OCTOBER 1984 WITH COMPARISONS 1/

PAYMENT METHOD	JUL 8-14, 1984	OCT 7-13, 1984
	PERCENT	
WAGES ONLY	58	51
BONUS	2	4
ROOM AND BOARD	7	7
HOUSING	13	14
MEALS OR FOOD	8	6
OTHER	12	18

1/ EXCLUDES AGRICULTURAL SERVICE WORKERS.

WORKERS ON FARMS, BY STATES AND REGIONS, OCTOBER 7-13, 1984

STATE AND REGION	ALL FARM WORKERS 1/	SELF-EMPLOYED	UNPAID	HIRED		
				NUMBER OF WORKERS	EXPECTED TO BE EMPLOYED	
					150 DAYS OR MORE	149 DAYS OR LESS
	THOUSANDS					
N Y	99	36	25	38	23	15
PA	81	36	24	21	15	6
VA	56	31	12	13	7	6
NORTHEAST 2/	355	148	82	125	76	49
ARK	63	38	10	15	13	2
FLA	85	18	4	63	52	11
GA	68	28	8	32	13	19
LA	32	15	2	15	9	6
MISS	42	22	5	15	12	3
N C	75	39	11	25	14	11
SOUTHEAST 3/	547	253	59	235	150	85
ILL	141	86	28	27	16	11
IND	70	42	17	11	9	2
IOWA	151	85	44	22	12	10
KY	90	43	22	25	13	12
MICH	101	49	20	32	8	24
MINN	168	96	44	28	17	11
MO	106	72	21	13	12	1
OHIO	73	40	11	22	19	3
WIS	155	74	43	38	29	9
NORTH CENTRAL	1,055	587	250	218	135	83
KANS	88	58	15	15	11	4
NEBR	86	40	24	22	18	4
TEX	209	125	20	64	44	20
PLAINS 4/	564	318	102	144	109	35
ARIZ	25	3	11	11	8	3
COLO	36	19	9	8	6	2
IDAHO	40	18	4	18	8	10
INTER-MOUNTAIN 5/	180	75	50	55	34	21
CALIF	234	45	14	175	113	62
HAW	15	2	1	12	10	2
OREG	49	21	7	21	13	8
WASH	60	18	2	40	12	28
PACIFIC	358	86	24	248	148	100
U S (49 STS)	3,059	1,467	567	1,025	652	373

1/ EXCLUDES AGRICULTURAL SERVICE WORKERS. 2/ LISTED STATES PLUS CONN, DEL, MAINE, MD, MASS, N H, N J, R I, VT, AND W VA. 3/ LISTED STATES PLUS ALA, S C, AND TENN. 4/ LISTED STATES PLUS N DAK, OKLA, AND S DAK. 5/ LISTED STATES PLUS MONT, NEV, N MEX, UTAH, AND WYO.

HOURS WORKED PER WEEK AND WAGE RATES FOR ALL HIRED WORKERS, BY STATES AND REGIONS, OCTOBER 7-13, 1984, 1/

STATE AND REGION	HOURS WORKED			WAGE RATE
	SELF-EMPLOYED	UNPAID	HIRED	ALL HIRED
	HOURS			DOLLARS PER HOUR
N Y	64.2	38.9	47.6	3.80
PA	57.4	45.3	35.0	4.12
VA	37.5	31.4	37.9	3.80
NORTHEAST 2/	51.6	39.4	42.2	4.01
ARK	31.7	35.9	38.3	4.15
FLA	33.9	33.5	36.8	4.91
GA	39.4	35.2	24.0	3.56
LA	36.8	25.5	35.3	4.17
MISS	25.6	31.7	32.2	4.07
N C	39.3	36.0	35.1	3.92
SOUTHEAST 3/	33.1	33.3	33.2	4.14
ILL	44.1	39.9	44.8	4.36
IND	47.1	34.9	41.3	3.91
IOWA	52.0	37.1	34.5	4.30
KY	34.5	27.5	34.4	4.33
MICH	41.3	31.7	33.0	4.68
MINN	48.0	34.6	43.1	4.11
MO	33.4	30.8	37.0	4.06
OHIO	38.3	38.0	41.8	4.42
WIS	58.3	37.8	38.8	3.65
NORTH CENTRAL	45.2	35.2	38.6	4.17
KANS	49.7	44.2	37.4	4.90
NEBR	55.0	52.3	48.9	4.80
TEX	32.9	34.4	42.4	4.35
PLAINS 4/	43.7	38.1	43.[illegible]	4.63
ARIZ	50.2	40.0	48.1	4.80
COLO	42.0	32.1	42.6	4.45
IDAHO	48.0	42.0	54.0	3.98
INTER-MOUNTAIN 5/	48.0	38.7	49.5	4.25
CALIF	38.8	35.5	44.6	5.32
HAW	31.0	28.4	37.7	7.42
OREG	33.0	35.0	36.0	4.81
WASH	40.0	37.0	44.0	5.98
PACIFIC	37.5	35.2	43.4	5.48
U S (49 STS)	43.1	36.4	40.2	4.56

1/ EXCLUDES AGRICULTURAL SERVICE WORKERS. 2/ LISTED STATES PLUS CONN, DEL, MAINE, MD, MASS, N H, N J, R I, VT, AND W VA. 3/ LISTED STATES PLUS ALA, S C, AND TENN. 4/ LISTED STATES PLUS N DAK, OKLA, AND S DAK. 5/ LISTED STATES PLUS MONT, NEV, N MEX, UTAH, AND WYO.

WAGE RATES FOR HIRED WORKERS, BY STATES AND REGIONS, OCTOBER 7-13, 1984 1/

STATE AND REGION	TYPE OF WORK					METHOD OF PAY		
	FIELD	LIVESTOCK	FIELD & LIVESTOCK 2/	SUPER-VISORY	OTHER	HOURLY	PIECE-RATE	OTHER
	DOLLARS PER HOUR							
N Y	4.04	2.92	3.66	7/	4.55	3.56	7/	3.30
PA	3.74	3.89	3.81	7/	4.62	4.05	7/	4.41
VA	3.65	3.78	3.68	7/	4.03	3.73	7/	3.64
NORTHEAST 3/	4.01	3.41	3.80	5.95	4.59	3.96	4.66	3.69
ARK	3.56	4.36	3.76	6.14	4.43	4.07	7/	4.27
FLA	4.27	4.82	4.40	7.46	5.43	4.70	7/	5.79
GA	3.08	3.88	3.33	7/	3.71	3.53	7/	3.46
LA	3.85	7/	3.90	6.25	4.25	3.95	7/	4.85
MISS	3.43	3.20	3.35	5.75	3.72	3.54	7/	4.78
N C	3.76	4.09	3.84	7/	4.02	3.93	7/	3.74
SOUTHEAST 4/	3.73	4.20	3.86	6.21	4.25	4.02	4.20	4.50
ILL	4.17	4.03	4.14	7.24	4.40	4.27	7/	4.53
IND	3.53	4.61	3.87	7/	3.88	3.80	7/	4.35
IOWA	4.11	4.14	4.12	7/	4.29	4.21	7/	4.74
KY	3.75	4.55	4.05	7/	5.90	4.23	7/	4.28
MICH	4.65	4.40	4.62	7/	7/	4.52	7/	3.92
MINN	4.64	3.09	3.72	7/	4.63	4.24	7/	4.03
MO	3.39	4.09	3.82	7/	4.34	3.99	7/	4.73
OHIO	4.07	3.76	3.98	7.72	6.00	4.30	7/	4.80
WIS	3.98	3.29	3.49	7/	4.22	3.67	7/	3.59
NORTH CENTRAL	4.13	3.67	3.94	6.88	4.52	4.12	4.59	4.22
KANS	5.40	4.90	5.00	7/	4.80	4.85	7/	5.02
NEBR	5.01	4.53	4.64	6.21	4.37	4.87	7/	4.74
TEX	4.00	4.20	4.12	6.50	4.70	4.31	7/	4.50
PLAINS 5/	4.36	4.36	4.36	6.34	4.76	4.63	4.00	4.68
ARIZ	4.61	4.17	4.52	6.42	5.22	4.51	7/	5.61
COLO	4.67	3.36	4.03	7.82	4.71	4.34	7/	4.55
IDAHO	4.00	3.56	3.88	7/	4.30	4.00	7/	3.89
INTER-MOUNTAIN 6/	4.22	3.74	4.07	6.08	4.28	4.21	5.12	4.23
CALIF	4.93	5.10	4.98	7.36	5.83	5.05	7.08	6.32
HAW	6.52	7/	6.48	10.34	8.25	7.01	7/	9.72
OREG	4.96	4.17	4.71	5.61	4.89	4.76	7/	4.52
WASH	5.89	6.37	5.94	6.54	6.02	5.27	7/	6.50
PACIFIC	5.22	5.10	5.19	7.33	5.92	5.14	6.23	6.29
U S (49 STS)	4.40	4.12	4.31	6.62	4.78	4.45	5.32	4.64

1/ EXCLUDES AGRICULTURAL SERVICE WORKERS. 2/ WAGE RATES OF FIELD AND LIVESTOCK WORKERS COMBINED. 3/ LISTED STATES PLUS CONN, DEL, MAINE, MD, MASS, N H, N J, R I, VT, AND W VA. 4/ LISTED STATES PLUS ALA, S C, AND TENN. 5/ LISTED STATES PLUS N DAK, OKLA, AND S DAK. 6/ LISTED STATES PLUS MONT, NEV, N MEX, UTAH, AND WYO. 7/ INSUFFICIENT DATA FOR THIS CATEGORY-DATA INCLUDED IN ALL HIRED FARM WORKERS AND IN REGION AND U S WAGE RATES.

WORKERS ON FARMS, BY STATES AND REGIONS, JULY 8-14, 1984 1/

STATE AND REGION	ALL FARM WORKERS 2/	SELF-EMPLOYED	UNPAID	HIRED		
				NUMBER OF WORKERS	EXPECTED TO BE EMPLOYED	
					150 DAYS OR MORE	149 DAYS OR LESS
	THOUSANDS					
N Y	105	34	25	46	27	19
PA	107	35	38	34	20	14
VA	68	37	12	19	6	13
NORTHEAST 3/	438	157	111	170	98	72
ARK	71	38	12	21	15	6
FLA	72	20	6	46	38	8
GA	80	28	9	43	17	26
LA	37	17	2	18	11	7
MISS	57	24	9	24	14	10
N C	163	43	25	95	19	76
SOUTHEAST 4/	710	262	110	338	146	192
ILL	140	69	26	45	12	33
IND	91	50	18	23	8	15
IOWA	186	90	48	48	11	37
KY	96	52	21	23	12	11
MICH	122	50	29	43	11	32
MINN	208	90	75	43	21	22
MO	147	79	42	26	9	17
OHIO	120	54	27	39	17	22
WIS	170	64	60	46	28	18
NORTH CENTRAL	1,280	598	346	336	129	207
KANS	98	51	24	23	7	16
NEBR	102	44	27	31	16	15
TEX	220	100	30	90	50	40
PLAINS 5/	636	284	157	195	97	98
ARIZ	29.5	3.5	11	15	11	4
COLO	50	22	15	13	7	6
IDAHO	51	21	7	23	8	15
INTER-MOUNTAIN 6/	238	86	67	85	47	38
CALIF	273	55	12	206	119	87
HAW	16	2.4	1.6	12	10	2
OREG	81	23	11	47	15	32
WASH	78	20	12	46	17	29
PACIFIC	448	100.4	36.6	311	161	150
U S (49 STS)	3,750	1,487.4	827.6	1,435	678	757

1/ NO REVISIONS. 2/ EXCLUDES AGRICULTURAL SERVICE WORKERS. 3/ LISTED STATES PLUS CONN, DEL, MAINE, MD, MASS, N H, N J, R I, VT, AND W VA. 4/ LISTED STATES PLUS ALA, S C, AND TENN. 5/ LISTED STATES PLUS N DAK, OKLA, AND S DAK. 6/ LISTED STATES PLUS MONT, NEV, N MEX, UTAH, AND WYO.

HOURS WORKED PER WEEK AND WAGE RATES FOR ALL HIRED WORKERS, BY STATES AND REGIONS, JULY 8-14, 1984, 1/ 2/

STATE AND REGION	HOURS WORKED			WAGE RATE
	SELF-EMPLOYED	UNPAID	HIRED	ALL HIRED
	HOURS			DOLLARS PER HOUR
N Y	68.5	45.4	44.5	3.39
PA	57.7	45.9	36.3	3.86
VA	36.7	36.4	28.7	3.73
NORTHEAST 3/	50.9	42.6	37.0	3.72
ARK	39.7	35.4	40.7	3.95
FLA	29.2	34.8	38.9	4.66
GA	41.8	44.0	33.0	3.41
LA	32.8	32.6	34.7	4.19
MISS	33.6	30.8	41.0	3.52
N C	38.4	39.7	26.3	3.55
SOUTHEAST 4/	37.0	35.6	33.0	3.71
ILL	46.1	33.1	25.8	4.09
IND	45.5	37.6	30.6	3.76
IOWA	47.6	41.2	24.2	3.98
KY	36.1	39.9	31.4	4.13
MICH	49.5	34.9	35.1	4.10
MINN	59.3	42.8	34.0	3.78
MO	44.5	39.8	30.5	3.83
OHIO	38.9	37.1	28.1	4.26
WIS	64.7	43.3	36.4	3.16
NORTH CENTRAL	48.8	40.0	30.6	3.87
KANS	61.2	50.8	37.3	4.50
NEBR	71.0	51.5	43.2	4.10
TEX	41.8	39.5	42.4	4.01
PLAINS 5/	54.8	45.9	41.8	4.25
ARIZ	47.4	29.6	55.5	4.22
COLO	52.9	45.3	50.6	4.26
IDAHO	55.6	41.3	49.5	3.59
INTER-MOUNTAIN 6/	56.5	39.5	52.9	3.90
CALIF	39.6	39.2	40.7	5.16
HAW	30.4	27.5	37.7	7.21
OREG	46.0	39.3	34.7	4.24
WASH	57.0	36.0	42.0	4.78
PACIFIC	44.3	37.7	39.9	5.06
U S (49 STS)	48.2	40.8	36.8	4.16

1/ NO REVISIONS. 2/ EXCLUDES AGRICULTURAL SERVICE WORKERS. 3/ LISTED STATES PLUS CONN, DEL, MAINE, MD, MASS, N H, N J, R I, VT, AND W VA.
4/ LISTED STATES PLUS ALA, S C, AND TENN. 5/ LISTED STATES PLUS N DAK, OKLA, AND S DAK. 6/ LISTED STATES PLUS MONT, NEV, N MEX, UTAH, AND WYO.

WAGE RATES FOR HIRED WORKERS, BY STATES AND REGIONS, JULY 8-14, 1984 1/ 2/

STATE AND REGION	TYPE OF WORK					METHOD OF PAY		
	FIELD	LIVESTOCK	FIELD & LIVESTOCK 3/	SUPER-VISORY	OTHER	HOURLY	PIECE-RATE	OTHER
	DOLLARS PER HOUR							
N Y	3.30	3.00	3.20	5.30	4.30	3.43	8/	3.24
PA	3.78	3.48	3.71	8/	5.27	3.90	8/	3.69
VA	3.74	3.49	3.70	8/	8/	3.70	8/	3.82
NORTHEAST 4/	3.58	3.27	3.49	5.63	4.78	3.78	4.07	3.55
ARK	3.62	4.40	3.81	5.14	3.90	3.95	8/	3.96
FLA	4.09	4.20	4.11	7.14	5.69	4.51	8/	5.18
GA	3.07	3.79	3.22	8/	3.61	3.47	8/	3.34
LA	3.89	4.08	3.91	6.30	4.37	4.10	8/	4.78
MISS	3.32	3.42	3.35	8/	3.45	3.46	8/	3.65
N C	3.40	4.19	3.48	8/	3.70	3.47	8/	4.26
SOUTHEAST 5/	3.42	3.88	3.49	5.89	4.05	3.72	3.11	3.84
ILL	3.89	3.64	3.85	8/	4.77	4.06	8/	4.14
IND	3.65	3.53	3.60	8/	3.95	3.69	8/	3.89
IOWA	3.81	3.77	3.80	8/	4.74	4.04	8/	3.82
KY	3.39	4.30	3.93	8/	5.70	4.06	8/	4.07
MICH	3.96	4.47	4.02	8/	3.94	3.97	8/	5.40
MINN	3.84	3.21	3.67	8/	3.65	3.98	8/	2.90
MO	3.41	4.01	3.60	8/	4.05	3.89	8/	3.87
OHIO	4.04	3.84	4.00	8/	8/	4.27	8/	4.20
WIS	3.20	2.75	2.98	8/	3.43	3.16	8/	3.16
NORTH CENTRAL	3.77	3.53	3.70	6.16	4.13	3.89	3.82	3.79
KANS	4.00	4.20	4.03	8/	4.69	4.45	8/	4.40
NEBR	4.20	4.30	4.23	8/	3.80	4.32	8/	3.85
TEX	3.80	4.00	3.87	8/	4.00	3.90	8/	4.10
PLAINS 6/	3.93	4.24	4.02	6.11	4.43	4.18	5.86	4.25
ARIZ	3.87	4.15	3.92	6.17	4.75	3.93	8/	5.28
COLO	3.35	4.52	4.03	8/	4.51	4.11	8/	4.39
IDAHO	3.48	3.44	3.47	8/	4.26	3.60	8/	3.50
INTER-MOUNTAIN 7/	3.63	4.18	3.75	5.85	3.85	3.81	4.24	4.00
CALIF	4.88	4.87	4.88	6.90	5.47	4.83	6.79	6.07
HAW	6.13	8/	6.11	10.03	8.60	6.90	8/	8.80
OREG	4.29	4.00	4.23	8/	4.20	4.22	8/	3.80
WASH	4.33	8/	4.51	8/	5.56	4.73	8/	5.65
PACIFIC	4.75	4.85	4.76	6.88	5.55	4.84	5.64	5.76
U S (49 STS)	3.93	3.93	3.93	6.28	4.45	4.12	4.60	4.17

1/ NO REVISIONS. 2/ EXCLUDES AGRICULTURAL SERVICE WORKERS. 3/ WAGE RATES OF FIELD AND LIVESTOCK WORKERS COMBINED. 4/ LISTED STATES PLUS CONN, DEL, MAINE, MD, MASS, N H, N J, R I, VT, AND W VA. 5/ LISTED STATES PLUS ALA, S C, AND TENN. 6/ LISTED STATES PLUS N DAK, OKLA, AND S DAK. 7/ LISTED STATES PLUS MONT, NEV, N MEX, UTAH, AND WYO. 8/ INSUFFICIENT DATA FOR THIS CATEGORY-DATA INCLUDED IN ALL HIRED FARM WORKERS AND IN REGION AND U S WAGE RATES.

AGRICULTURAL SERVICES

Crew leaders and custom crews provided 190,000 workers for the Nation's farms during the week of October 7-13, 1984. In July of this year, 326,000 farm workers were custom crews. The number of agricultural service workers in all areas except the Northeast and California was sharply lower than in July. Harvesting of fall crops in the Northeast and California kept the number of agricultural service workers on farms at about the same level as July.

The average hourly wages received by workers furnished by agricultural service firms in California and Florida were $6.41 and $5.04 per hour, respectively. Comparable wage rates in July were $6.14 in California and $4.29 in Florida.

AGRICULTURAL SERVICES: NUMBER OF WORKERS, AVERAGE HOURS WORKED FOR ALL HIRED WORKERS, WAGE RATE BY TYPE OF WORK, WITH COMPARISONS, FOR CALIFORNIA, FLORIDA, AND UNITED STATES, OCTOBER 7-13, 1984 1/ 2/

ITEM	JUL 1984			OCT 1984		
	CALIF	FLA	U S	CALIF	FLA	U S
	THOUSANDS					
NUMBER OF WORKERS WORKING ON FARMS	75	7.5	326	63	4.8	190
	HOURS					
AVERAGE HOURS WORKED	41.4	41.8	3/	37.4	31.9	3/
	DOLLARS PER HOUR					
WAGE RATES	6.14	4.29	3/	6.41	5.04	3/
METHOD OF PAY						
HOURLY	5.41	4.48	3/	5.50	4.19	3/
PIECE-RATE	6.60	3.98	3/	7.00	5.50	3/
TYPE OF WORK PERFORMED						
FIELD	5.05	3.90	3/	5.35	4.46	3/

1/ DATA IN THIS TABLE ARE FOR AGRICULTURAL SERVICES PERFORMED ON THE FARM BY CUSTOM SERVICE UNITS SUCH AS CREW LEADERS OR CUSTOM CREWS. THESE STATISTICS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE STATE-REGIONAL TABLES.
2/ VALUE OF ANY PERQUISITES PROVIDED ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE WAGE RATE.
3/ NOT AVAILABLE.

Representative **Obey**. All right. Congressman Lungren.

Representative **Lungren**. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Trying to get back to the question of what job growth means in the different sectors, at the end of January, your Bureau issued a statistical release on the weekly earnings of workers and their families.

How would you describe the increase in median earnings in the fourth quarter?

[Ms. Norwood perusing documents.]

Representative **Lungren**. I didn't mean to catch you unawares.

Ms. **Norwood**. That's quite all right. They, I'm sure, were up.

Representative **Lungren**. You said that they were 5.9 percent higher than the previous year.

Ms. **Norwood**. For median earnings of families with wage and salary workers, that's correct. And that exceeded, of course, the rate of inflation.

Representative **Lungren**. I take it that's a significant increase?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes. Yes, indeed.

Representative **Lungren**. Without, I guess, going into, how you break that down into quarters, that basis, it does appear that those who are working, and I'm not trying to diminish the problems of those who are not working, but it does seem to me to at least indicate that those who are working were working at rates of pay that allowed them at least to keep up substantially with inflation and beyond.

Let me ask you this, Ms. Norwood, skipping to another area, about the weekly hours and overtime in manufacturing that we have with the figures that you bring us today. In the past, you have told us that those figures have remained at somewhat—you may even have used the phrase "relatively high levels."

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes.

Representative **Lungren**. Is that still true? Are we seeing any diminution in that?

Ms. **Norwood**. Well, as I said earlier, in the month of February average weekly hours in manufacturing nosedived. I think it's related to particularly bad weather and I would not attach too much importance to that. They are relatively high. They have been higher but they are still holding up.

Representative **Lungren**. The reason I asked that is in explaining to those of us trying to figure out what all that means, there was the indication that when they are at relatively high levels, this might be at least one indication of potential additional employment gains to come.

And if that's the case, I was somewhat concerned about the nosedive we saw with the 1-month figures. Are you telling us we have got to wait until next month to see where we are, to see if in fact it is the precursor of bad news or harbinger of good news?

Ms. **Norwood**. I would tend to discount a great deal this 1-month shift in hours.

Representative **Lungren**. It's my understanding that the 3.6 percent gain in business productivity during 1984 was the largest increase in over a decade.

Can you tell me when the last time business productivity increased by that much? Do we have those statistics available?

Ms. NORWOOD. Mr. Mark is our expert here. He, I'm sure, would know.

Representative LUNGREN. It's a big question that comes up in our deliberations here. And one of the big questions is: How do you get productivity gains?

I'm just trying to find out if in fact we have some of some significance in this past year.

Ms. NORWOOD. The productivity increases in the business sector were 3.6 percent in 1971, 3.5 in 1972, and 3.3 in 1976. That's a long time ago.

Representative LUNGREN. The nonfarm business labor productivity rose at 3.5 percent in 1983, 3.1 percent in 1984, and how does that compare with the productivity gains of the previous 6 or 7 years?

Ms. NORWOOD. It's much higher.

Mr. MARK. It's much higher. The last period when we had a rate that high was in 1976, when it was 3.2. That was the recovery year.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you.

I have one question on this employment population ratio and labor force participation. It appears, at least from the data you bring us today, that those figures for adult females are at an all-time high. I wonder, is that rate of increase going to crest? I mean, do you anticipate that cresting? Or, is this a phenomenon that we've got that we really don't see cresting in the near future?

Or, do we have any data or any basis upon which to make a judgment at this point in time?

Ms. NORWOOD. There are many different points of view on that. My own personal one is that the rate of labor force participation for women will continue to increase, but at a somewhat slower rate than it did in the seventies.

It's rather interesting to note that, in February, for women from 20 to 44 years of age, their participation rates were over 70 percent. They ranged from 70.5 to 71.8 percent. That's extraordinarily high. In 1970, those rates were around the 50 percent range.

Representative LUNGREN. The reason I'm trying to find out about this is that we've discussed this many times before. We've had the postwar baby boomers go through. We have less people demographically coming into the labor force. Yet, we see this tremendous labor force growth at the same time we're seeing demographically a diminution of the increase. So I have to look at other factors.

One of them has been this rapid increase in female participation. And I wonder if we anticipate a crest in that, or is this some phenomenon that we really don't have a handle on in terms of interpretation.

The reason I say that is as we look at these challenges that you and I have discussed over the last couple of years, with the demographics changing, we thought that maybe we didn't have to have the same percentage of increase in jobs on a yearly basis to make the impact on the unemployment rate.

Yet, we see with this strong labor force growth that maybe some of us were too optimistic in looking forward to something which has not come to pass. And I'm trying to get a handle on this phenomenon we see with participation. And I'm not making a comment on whether it's good or it's bad, just what is it that we look forward to? And is this something that is going to make it more difficult from a statistical standpoint of anticipating a drop in the unemployment rate?

Ms. NORWOOD. Actually, the future will see somewhat less upward pressure from factors of these kinds than we had in the sixties and the seventies. That's because labor force growth in total is anticipated to slow down a bit. It's because we have passed through the baby boom generations growing up. And it's because the massive increase of labor force participation of women occurred in the sixties and the seventies.

Now, having said that, I think it is important to recognize that we are, if we're looking at upward pressure on unemployment, we have teenagers who, though smaller in numbers have, at least in recent months, begun to increase their labor force participation rates.

We have women who are continuing to increase their labor force participation rates. We have in this country now more than half of husband-wife families with more than one earner. A large proportion of our youngsters even under the age of a year now have working mothers.

We have, therefore, I think an increasing view that the standard of living of American families is going to be based upon two incomes. So I believe that we will see an increasing rate of participation but I do not believe that we will see the kind of growth that we saw in the seventies.

One other factor that I think is going to put upward pressure on the unemployment rate is that it is quite clear that if you go back in time, the birthrates of the black population declined, as did the whites, but black fertility was at a higher rate and remains higher than for whites. As of 1983, the Hispanic fertility rate was higher than for blacks or whites. The result is that when we look forward in time, we believe that we will be seeing a much larger proportion of the new entrants to the labor force as members of our minority population.

As we have discussed here many times, the minority population of the country generally has a much higher rate of unemployment. They have more difficulty in the labor market. They are located frequently in different places of the country where it's harder to find jobs.

So that is going to put upward pressure on the unemployment rate.

So we're going to have, I think, factors which will work on both sides.

Representative LUNGREN. Thank you, Madam Commissioner. My time is up. I just wanted to say one thing because I have to leave a little early. If I can be parochial for a moment, your office was good enough to give us the statistics for California and at least I can look at those on somewhat of a happy note. We have employment on a seasonally adjusted basis for California of just under 12 million, which shows a gain of 64,000 since January 1985.

The fifth consecutive month, seasonally adjusted employment has reached a new high and the unemployment rate in my home

State now is down to 6.7 percent in February 1985, which is the lowest it's been since May 1981.

So I know that it's mixed information around the country but at least when I get good information I would like to share it for the record, for my own home State.

The chairman, I guess, is on the phone so I guess it's——

Representative HAWKINS [presiding]. He left the gavel. I just didn't move over, Congressman Lungren.

Representative LUNGREN. I will give it back to the new chairman.

Representative HAWKINS. Temporarily.

Ms. Norwood, I've read again your statement and you, I think, very specifically bring out the point that there is something happening in the economy, in which manufacturing industries are declining, it would seem, at least in employment; and increasing in the service producing sector.

Now I'm not so sure that that's a simple explanation for that. I think it goes much beyond weather, however. Would the statistical gathering that you engage in indicate the nature of that shift?

Last week, I listened to Lee Iacocca describe not only what was happening in the automobile manufacturing industry but in telecommunications, textile, and steel, et cetera, some 15 industries. According to his thesis, there is something more basic happening that just, let's say, weather conditions or a pattern, a temporary pattern in American life. To him, it was a process of deindustrialization. That is, we're losing out in these industries to foreign countries and that, in his opinon, they are not likely to come back.

In other words, what you describe seems to be a situation that will not reverse itself or reverse itself very easily. That leads me into asking you whether or not the jobs that are being gained in this process in quality—in terms of quality, I'm now referring to wage rates—how do they compare with specifically those that are being lost? In other words, if an individual in the automobile manufacturing industry—or some of the other industries—lose their jobs, let's say, paying $15 to $20 an hour and the individuals are gaining the jobs, in the industries that ordinarily are paying $5 an hour, in some instances in the food industry, it may be as low as the minimum wage.

It would seem that if an individual loses such a job, a job is lost—not the individual. A job is lost in the one instance at $15 an hour, and jobs are being gained at $5 an hour, what you have then is a situation of three people now being employed where one previously was employed.

To what extent does this account then for this tremendous increase in jobs in the last few years? To what extent is this the situation rather than the economy producing the jobs that are comparable to those that were lost?

Would your statistics in any way shed any light on this situation, because if it does, then it simply means that the Nation is worse off, even though the employment rate may be going up, the employment numbers may be going up; however, as the Nation itself, the economy is no better off from the viewpoint of the earnings that are being earned and the revenues that are being paid on those earnings.

Ms. **Norwood**. Congressman Hawkins, we did a special survey looking at displaced workers. In January 1984, we looked at people between basically January 1979 and 1984. We had to develop our own definition of displacement, because there are a lot of definitions around. It's a very popular subject.

Representative **Hawkins**. Would it include—if I may interrupt. Would it include displacement as the result of imports?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes, it would involve people who had been working at their jobs for at least 3 years and who lost their jobs because of the closing down or moving of a plant, because of slack work, or the abolishment of a position or shift. We found that if we defined them that way, there were a little more than 5 million people who in that 4-year period had lost their jobs. About 60 percent of them were reemployed, when we surveyed them in January 1984.

Representative **Hawkins**. Employed in the same——

Ms. **Norwood**. No, they had jobs in a different plant or company.

Representative **Hawkins**. They were just simply——

Ms. **Norwood**. They were reemployed, but not back in the same place.

Representative **Hawkins**. Not necessarily at the old job, but they——

Ms. **Norwood**. No, sir, not in their old jobs. And about 25 percent of the displaced workers were looking for work and the rest of them, something like 700,000, had left the labor force. Now if you look at those who were reemployed and look at their earnings, a large proportion of them were earning less money than they had before. For example, for 2.3 million people who were reemployed in full-time wage and salary jobs, about 620,000 were earning 20 percent or more below their former earnings; 320,000 were earning less money but within 20 percent of what they had earned. About 1.1 million were earning the same amount or more than they were before and some of these, about 500,000, were earning at least 20 percent more than they were before.

Thus, about 45 percent of the 2 million workers who were reemployed full time and for whom we obtained data were earning less money than before they had been displaced.

Representative **Hawkins**. And the other 55, how was that divided?

Ms. **Norwood**. I can submit that for the record.

Representative **Hawkins**. These were the fortunate ones, those who gained some type of employment, a considerable number of those who lost their jobs were still unemployed. Is that also true?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes. That is true.

Representative **Hawkins**. So we're talking really about the more fortunate ones, rather than the total number——

Ms. **Norwood**. The 60 percent who were reemployed.

Representative **Hawkins**. The other 40 percent would be distributed in what way? Did you speculate on how they would be distributed?

Ms. **Norwood**. Yes, about two-thirds were looking for work and the rest had left the labor force. I can supply the details for the record.

Representative **Hawkins**. I wish you would.

[The following information was subsequently supplied for the record:]

News

U.S. Department of Labor
Bureau of Labor Statistics
Washington D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1821
523-1959

USDL 84-492

Media contact: 523-1913

FOR RELEASE: IMMEDIATE
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1984

BLS REPORTS ON DISPLACED WORKERS

The Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor has completed a special study of workers whose jobs were abolished or plants shut down between January 1979 and January 1984.

The study shows that of 5.1 million workers who had been at their jobs at least 3 years before they were displaced, 60 percent (3.1 million) were reemployed when surveyed in January 1984, though many at lower pay; about 25 percent (1.3 million) were looking for work and the rest (700,000) had left the labor force.

Among the displaced workers who were reemployed, about 360,000 who had previously been in full-time wage and salary jobs were in part-time jobs when surveyed. Among those who were once again in full-time jobs--and reported earnings for both the old and new jobs--about 45 percent were earning less in the new job than in the one they had lost.

A displaced worker, as defined in this study, is one who (1) lost a job between January 1979 and January 1984, (2) had worked at least three years in that job, and (3) lost it because of the closing down or moving of a plant or company, slack work, or the abolishment of a position or shift.

The survey on which this study is based was sponsored by the Employment and Training Administration and was conducted as a supplement to the January 1984 Current Population Survey. (For a description of the supplement, see the explanatory note on page 4.) Altogether, a total of 11.5 million workers 20 years of age and over were identified in this survey as having lost jobs during the January 1979-January 1984 period because of one of the three factors listed above. However, a large number of these workers had been at their jobs only a relatively short period when the loss occurred, with 4.4 million reporting one year or less of tenure on the lost job. To focus on workers who had developed a relatively firm attachment to the jobs they lost, only those with a minimum of 3 years of tenure are included in this analysis, and the data presented in tables 1 through 7 relate only to these 5.1 million workers.

Employment status in January 1984

The chance of reemployment for these displaced workers declined significantly with age. While the overall proportion who were employed in January 1984 was 60 percent, this varied from 70 percent for those 20 to 24 years of age to 41 percent for those 55 to 64 years of age. Those 65 years and over often retire when they lose a job, so the proportion in this age

Centennial
of Labor
Statistics

group who were employed in January 1984 was only 21 percent. (See table 1.)

Over one-fourth of the displaced workers 55 to 64 years of age and as many as two-thirds of those 65 years and over were out of the labor force--that is, were neither employed nor unemployed--when studied. Women in general were somewhat less likely than men to be reemployed and more likely to have left the labor force.

Of the 5.1 million workers who had lost a job over the previous 5 years, about 1.3 million, or one-fourth, were unemployed when surveyed in January 1984. The proportion unemployed was about 23 percent among whites, 41 percent among blacks, and 34 percent among Hispanics.

Reasons for displacement

Almost one-half (49.0 percent) of the 5.1 million workers reported they had lost their jobs because their plant or company had closed down or moved. Another two-fifths (38.7 percent) cited "slack work" as the reason. The balance (12.4 percent) reported that their position or shift had been abolished. (See table 2.) The older the worker, the more likely was the job loss to stem from plant closings. Younger workers, having generally less seniority, were about as likely to have lost their jobs due to slack work as due to plant closings.

Years worked on lost job

Many of the 5.1 million displaced workers had been in their jobs for relatively long periods. Nearly one-third (30.2 percent) had been displaced from jobs on which they had worked 10 years or more. Another third (33.6 percent) had been on their jobs from 5 to 9 years. The remainder had lost jobs at which they had worked either 3 or 4 years. The median tenure on the lost jobs for the entire 5.1 million workers was 6.1 years. Not surprisingly, the length of tenure tended to increase with the age of the displaced workers. For example, median tenure for those 55 to 64 had been 12.4 years. (See table 3.)

Industry and occupation

Nearly 2.5 million, or almost one half of the workers in question, had been displaced from jobs in the manufacturing sector, principally in durable goods industries. (See table 4.) About 220,000 had worked in primary metals, 400,000 in machinery, except electrical, and 350,000 in the transportation equipment industry, with autos accounting for 225,000.

Of the workers who had lost jobs in the primary metals industry, less than half (45.7 percent) were employed in January 1984, and nearly two-fifths (38.7 percent) were still reported as unemployed. Of those who had lost jobs in the nonelectrical machinery industry or the transportation equipment industry, the proportion employed in January 1984 was over 60 percent.

From an occupational standpoint, operators, fabricators, and laborers figured most prominently among the workers who had been displaced from jobs. (See table 5.) In general, the higher the skill of the displaced workers, the more likely they were to be reemployed when surveyed. For example, among those who had been displaced from managerial and professional jobs, the proportion reemployed was about 75 percent. In contrast, among those who had lost jobs as handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers, less than one-half were reemployed.

Geographic distribution

Relatively large numbers of the workers who had been displaced from their jobs resided in the East North Central (1.2 million) and the Middle Atlantic (800,000) areas. (See table 6 for definitions of these areas.) This reflects in part the concentration of heavy industries in these two areas and the employment losses which these industries incurred in recent years. As shown in table 6, the workers who had been displaced in these two areas were less likely than those in other areas to be reemployed when surveyed in January 1984. Whereas the nationwide proportion who were reemployed was three-fifths, it was only about one-half in these two areas. The East North Central area had nearly one-third of all the displaced workers who were unemployed in January 1984--400,000 out of a national total of 1.3 million--and nearly one-half of those in the East North Central area had been unemployed for more than 6 months.

Earnings on new job

Of the 3.1 million displaced workers who were again employed in January 1984, a little over 2.8 million had previously held full-time wage and salary jobs. Of these, nearly 2.3 million, were once again working in full-time wage and salary jobs when surveyed. Earnings data for about 2 million of these workers were obtained both for the old and new jobs.

About 1.1 million (55 percent) of these 2 million workers reported weekly earnings from their new jobs that were equal to or higher than the earnings on the jobs they had lost, with 500,000 reporting that their earnings exceeded those on their previous jobs by 20 percent or more. On the other hand, about 900,000 (45 percent) reported earnings that were lower than those on the jobs they had lost, with about 600,000 having taken cuts of 20 percent or more. (See table 7.)

Workers who had been displaced from jobs in durable goods manufacturing were somewhat more likely than other workers to be earning less on the jobs they held in January 1984 than in those they had lost. About 40 percent of those who were in new full-time wage and salary jobs when surveyed in January 1984 reported weekly earnings of 20 percent or more below those on the jobs they had lost.

EXPLANATORY NOTE

The data presented in this report were obtained through a special survey conducted in January 1984 as a supplement to the Current Population Survey, the monthly survey which provides the basic data on employment and unemployment for the Nation. The purpose of this supplementary survey was to obtain information on the number and characteristics of workers 20 years of age and over who had been displaced from their jobs over the previous 5 years, that is, over the period from January 1979 to January 1984. This is the period during which the economy went through two back-to-back recessions and the levels of employment in some industries, particularly the goods-producing sector, were reduced considerably.

In order to identify workers who had been displaced from jobs, the survey respondents were first asked whether the household member had lost a job during the period in question "because of a plant closing, an employer going out of business, a layoff from which (he/she) was not recalled, or other similar reasons." If the answer to this question was "yes", the respondent was asked to identify, among the following reasons, the one which best fit the reason for the job loss:

- Plant or company closed down or moved
- Plant or company was operating but job was lost because of:
  - Slack work
  - Position or shift was abolished
  - Seasonal job was completed
- Self-employment business failed
- Other reasons

After ascertaining the reason for the job loss, a series of questions were asked about the nature of the lost job--including the year it was lost, the years of tenure, the earnings, and the availability of health insurance. Other questions were asked to determine what transpired after the job loss such as: How long did the person go without work, did he or she receive unemployment insurance benefits, were the benefits exhausted, and, finally, did the person move after the job loss. If the person was reemployed at the time of the interview, follow-up questions were asked to determine the current earnings. And, regardless of the employment status at the time of the interview, a question was asked of all those who had been reported as having lost a job to determine whether they currently had any health insurance coverage.

As noted earlier, in tabulating the data from this survey the only workers considered to have been displaced from their jobs were those who reported job losses arising from: (1) The closing down or moving of a plant or company, (2) slack work, or (3) the abolishment of their position or shift. This means that workers whose job losses stemmed from the completion of seasonal work, the failure of self-employment businesses, or other miscellaneous reasons were not included among those deemed to have been displaced. A further condition for inclusion among the displaced workers for the purpose of this study was tenure of at least 3 years on the lost job.

In examining the displaced workers who were unemployed in January 1984, it is important to note that not all were continually unemployed since the job loss they reported. Many, particularly those who reported job losses which occurred in 1979 or the very early 1980's, may subsequently have held other jobs, only to find themselves unemployed once again in January 1984.

More detailed analysis of the data from this supplement, including topics not covered in this release, will be forthcoming.

Table 1. Employment status of displaced workers by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin, January 1984

(Percent)

Age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin	Total 1/ (thousands)	Total	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the labor force
TOTAL					
Total, 20 years and over	5,091	100.0	60.1	25.5	14.4
20 to 24 years	342	100.0	70.4	20.2	9.4
25 to 54 years	3,809	100.0	64.9	25.6	9.4
55 to 64 years	748	100.0	40.8	31.8	27.4
65 years and over	191	100.0	20.8	12.1	67.1
Men					
Total, 20 years and over	3,328	100.0	63.6	27.1	9.2
20 to 24 years	204	100.0	72.2	21.7	6.1
25 to 54 years	2,570	100.0	68.2	26.8	5.0
55 to 64 years	461	100.0	43.6	36.1	20.3
65 years and over	93	100.0	16.8	12.9	70.3
Women					
Total, 20 years and over	1,763	100.0	53.4	22.4	24.2
20 to 24 years	138	100.0	67.8	16.0	16.2
25 to 54 years	1,239	100.0	58.0	22.6	19.4
55 to 64 years	287	100.0	36.3	28.0	35.7
65 years and over	98	100.0	24.6	11.3	64.1
WHITE					
Total, 20 years and over	4,397	100.0	62.6	23.4	13.9
Men	2,913	100.0	66.1	25.1	8.8
Women	1,484	100.0	55.8	20.2	24.1
BLACK					
Total, 20 years and over	482	100.0	41.8	41.0	17.1
Men	238	100.0	43.9	44.7	11.4
Women	244	100.0	38.8	35.6	25.6
HISPANIC ORIGIN					
Total, 20 years and over	282	100.0	52.2	33.7	14.1
Men	189	100.0	55.2	35.5	9.3
Women	93	100.0	46.3	30.0	23.6

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table 2. Workers who were displaced from jobs between January 1979 and January 1984 by age, sex, race, Hispanic origin, and reason for job loss

(Percent)

Age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin	Total 1/ (thousands)	Total	Plant or company closed down or moved	Slack work	Position or shift abolished
TOTAL					
Total, 20 years and over	5,091	100.0	49.0	38.7	12.4
20 to 24 years	342	100.0	47.1	47.1	5.8
25 to 54 years	3,809	100.0	46.3	41.0	12.7
55 to 64 years	748	100.0	57.8	28.2	14.0
65 years and over	191	100.0	70.8	18.1	11.1
Men					
Total, 20 years and over	3,328	100.0	46.0	42.9	11.1
20 to 24 years	204	100.0	39.5	59.6	.9
25 to 54 years	2,570	100.0	43.9	44.8	11.3
55 to 64 years	461	100.0	55.6	30.5	14.0
65 years and over	92	100.0	68.7	15.7	15.5
Women					
Total, 20 years and over	1,763	100.0	54.6	30.8	14.6
20 to 24 years	138	100.0	58.3	29.7	12.9
25 to 54 years	1,239	100.0	51.1	33.1	15.8
55 to 64 years	287	100.0	61.4	24.5	14.1
65 years and over	98	100.0	72.8	20.3	6.9
WHITE					
Total, 20 years and over	4,397	100.0	49.6	37.9	12.5
Men	2,913	100.0	46.0	42.6	11.4
Women	1,484	100.0	56.7	28.7	14.6
BLACK					
Total, 20 years and over	602	100.0	43.8	44.7	11.6
Men	358	100.0	44.9	46.4	8.8
Women	244	100.0	42.2	42.2	15.7
HISPANIC ORIGIN					
Total, 20 years and over	282	100.0	47.4	45.2	7.3
Men	189	100.0	48.1	43.8	8.1
Women	93	100.0	46.2	48.1	5.7

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table 1. Workers who were displaced from jobs between January 1979 and January 1984 by age, sex, race, Hispanic origin, and tenure when job ended

(Percent)

Age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin	Total[1] (thousands)	Total	3 to 4 years	5 to 9 years	10 to 14 years	15 to 19 years	20 or more years	Median years on lost job
TOTAL								
Total, 20 years and over	5,091	100.0	36.2	33.6	14.7	6.7	8.8	6.1
25 years and over	4,749	100.0	33.5	34.5	15.5	7.1	9.4	6.5
25 to 54 years	3,809	100.0	37.9	36.9	14.5	5.9	4.7	5.8
55 to 64 years	748	100.0	15.5	23.2	21.2	12.2	27.8	12.4
65 years and over	191	100.0	14.6	31.1	12.3	11.8	30.0	11.6
Men								
Total, 20 years and over	3,328	100.0	34.6	31.6	15.8	7.4	10.6	6.6
25 years and over	3,123	100.0	31.6	32.8	16.5	7.8	11.3	7.0
25 to 54 years	2,570	100.0	35.8	35.2	16.2	6.7	6.1	6.2
55 to 64 years	461	100.0	12.8	19.5	19.0	13.0	35.5	14.6
65 years and over	92	100.0	14.3	25.0	12.1	12.9	35.6	14.3
Women								
Total, 20 years and over	1,763	100.0	39.4	37.6	12.6	5.3	5.1	5.7
25 years and over	1,625	100.0	36.7	38.2	13.6	5.6	5.7	5.8
25 to 54 years	1,239	100.0	42.4	40.4	11.1	4.2	1.9	5.5
55 to 64 years	287	100.0	19.7	29.1	24.7	11.0	15.5	10.2
65 years and over	99	100.0	14.9	36.9	12.5	11.0	24.7	9.6
WHITE								
Total, 20 years and over	4,397	100.0	36.3	33.5	14.8	6.5	8.9	6.1
Men	2,913	100.0	34.7	31.8	15.8	7.2	10.6	6.5
Women	1,484	100.0	39.3	36.9	12.9	5.2	5.7	5.7
BLACK								
Total, 20 years and over	602	100.0	36.6	34.4	14.0	7.2	7.8	6.1
Men	358	100.0	33.9	30.2	16.8	8.2	10.9	7.0
Women	244	100.0	40.7	40.4	9.8	5.8	3.3	5.5
HISPANIC ORIGIN								
Total, 20 years and over	282	100.0	37.9	32.6	13.9	6.2	8.7	5.8
Men	189	100.0	32.6	30.5	18.7	7.0	11.2	7.0
Women	93	100.0	48.5	36.4	6.0	4.3	4.7	5.1

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table 6. Employment status of displaced workers by industry and class of worker of lost job, January 1984

(Percent)

Industry and class of worker of lost job	Total1/ (thousands)	Total	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the labor force
Total, 20 years and over2/	5,091	100.0	60.1	25.5	14.4
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	4,700	100.0	59.8	25.8	14.4
Mining	150	100.0	60.4	31.0	8.6
Construction	401	100.0	55.0	30.7	14.3
Manufacturing	2,483	100.0	58.5	27.4	14.1
Durable goods	1,675	100.0	58.2	28.9	12.9
Lumber and wood products	81	100.0	67.9	19.1	13.0
Furniture and fixtures	43	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Stone, clay, and glass products	75	100.0	67.5	10.5	22.0
Primary metal industries	219	100.0	45.7	38.7	15.6
Fabricated metal products	173	100.0	62.5	31.7	5.8
Machinery, except electrical	396	100.0	62.3	27.4	10.3
Electrical machinery	164	100.0	48.2	34.5	17.3
Transportation equipment	356	100.0	62.0	26.6	11.4
Automobiles	226	100.0	62.9	24.0	13.1
Other transportation equipment	130	100.0	62.1	29.4	8.5
Professional and photographic equipment	54	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Other durable goods industries	62	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Nondurable goods	808	100.0	59.1	24.2	16.7
Food and kindred products	175	100.0	52.5	32.6	15.0
Textile mill products	90	100.0	59.8	26.3	13.9
Apparel and other finished textile products	132	100.0	63.0	14.2	22.8
Paper and allied products	60	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Printing and publishing	103	100.0	58.0	22.9	19.1
Chemical and allied products	119	100.0	66.0	27.3	6.7
Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products	100	100.0	62.8	18.3	18.8
Other nondurable goods industries	49	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Transportation and public utilities	336	100.0	57.9	28.8	13.3
Transportation	280	100.0	56.8	30.5	12.7
Communication and other public utilities	56	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Wholesale and retail trade	732	100.0	61.6	21.5	16.9
Wholesale trade	234	100.0	69.6	22.0	8.4
Retail trade	498	100.0	57.6	21.5	20.9
Finance, insurance, and real estate	91	100.0	78.5	12.4	9.1
Services	506	100.0	63.0	21.5	15.5
Professional services	187	100.0	64.0	19.9	16.1
Other service industries	318	100.0	63.6	22.9	13.5
Agricultural wage and salary workers	100	100.0	69.9	22.9	7.2
Government workers	248	100.0	63.3	18.7	18.0
Self-employed and unpaid family workers	25	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

2/ Total includes a small number who did not report industry or class of worker.

3/ Data not shown where base is less than 35,000.

Table 5. Employment status of displaced workers by occupation of lost job, January 1984

(Percent)

Occupation of lost job	Total1/ (thousands)	Total	Employed	Unemployed	Not in the labor force
Total, 20 years and over2/	5,091	100.0	60.1	25.5	14.4
Managerial and professional specialty	703	100.0	74.7	16.6	8.8
Executive, administrative, and managerial	444	100.0	75.7	15.6	8.7
Professional specialty	260	100.0	72.9	18.2	8.9
Technical, sales, and administrative support	1,182	100.0	60.6	21.0	18.3
Technicians and related support	122	100.0	67.6	25.5	6.9
Sales occupations	488	100.0	66.7	14.6	18.7
Administrative support, including clerical	572	100.0	54.1	25.5	20.5
Service occupations	275	100.0	51.0	24.1	24.9
Protective service	32	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Service, except private household and protective	243	100.0	53.0	23.6	23.4
Precision production, craft and repair	1,042	100.0	61.6	26.1	12.3
Mechanics and repairers	261	100.0	61.3	29.1	9.6
Construction trades	315	100.0	63.2	23.8	13.0
Other precision production, craft, and repair	467	100.0	60.6	26.0	13.4
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	1,823	100.0	54.6	31.6	13.7
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	1,144	100.0	56.0	27.5	16.5
Transportation and material moving occupations	324	100.0	63.8	28.7	7.5
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	355	100.0	41.6	47.6	10.8
Construction laborers	55	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	300	100.0	42.0	47.0	11.0
Farming, forestry, and fishing	88	100.0	(3)	(3)	(3)

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

2/ Total includes a small number who did not report occupation.

3/ Data not shown where base is less than 75,000.

Table 6. Employment status and area of residence in January 1984 of displaced workers by selected characteristics

(Numbers in thousands)

Characteristic	Total 1/	New England	Middle Atlantic	East North Central	West North Central	South Atlantic	East South Central	West South Central	Mountain	Pacific
WORKERS WHO LOST JOBS										
Total	5,091	260	794	1,206	428	664	378	484	211	667
Men	3,328	155	530	772	282	428	235	347	152	427
Women	1,763	105	264	434	145	236	143	137	59	241
REASON FOR JOB LOSS										
Plant or company closed down or moved	2,492	118	410	556	208	335	204	231	103	323
Slack work	1,970	106	269	513	166	238	132	211	83	256
Position or shift abolished	629	36	115	138	54	89	42	42	25	88
INDUSTRY OF LOST JOB										
Construction	481	18	68	88	36	81	34	63	30	63
Manufacturing	2,514	158	414	658	212	298	189	215	58	315
Durable goods	1,686	94	260	514	137	175	107	142	40	218
Nondurable goods	828	64	154	145	75	122	82	73	18	97
Transportation and public utilities	392	16	61	83	34	56	33	61	19	32
Wholesale and retail trade	780	41	100	182	68	132	60	56	52	90
Finance and service industries	649	22	122	133	45	70	52	56	30	132
Public administration	84	2	10	22	5	13	4	8	5	16
Other industries 2/	272	5	20	40	28	38	45	49	27	19
EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN JANUARY 1984										
Employed	3,058	171	428	621	276	461	209	344	148	399
Unemployed	1,299	48	225	400	96	117	113	85	35	181
Percent less than 5 weeks	22.1	(3)	26.1	21.2	13.0	29.4	17.3	25.4	(3)	18.4
Percent 27 weeks or more	38.9	(3)	36.9	47.2	47.5	25.5	51.7	29.8	(3)	28.0
Not in the labor force	733	41	141	185	56	85	56	55	30	86

1/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or the abolishment of their positions or shifts.

2/ Includes a small number who did not report industry.

3/ Data not shown where base is less than 75,000.

NOTE: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont compose the New England Division; New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania compose the Middle Atlantic Division; Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin compose the East North Central Division; Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, and South Dakota compose the West North Central Division; Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and West Virginia compose the South Atlantic Division; Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Tennessee compose the East South Central Division; Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas compose the West South Central Division; Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming compose the Mountain Division; Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington compose the Pacific Division.

Table 7. Characteristics of new job of displaced workers who lost full-time wage and salary jobs and were reemployed in January 1984 by industry of lost job

(In thousands)

Industry of lost job	Total reemployed January 1984	Part-time job	Full-time wage and salary job					Self employment or other full-time job
			Total 1/	Earnings relative to those of lost job				
				20 percent or more below	Below, but within 20 percent	Equal or above, but within 20 percent	20 percent or more above	
Total who lost full-time wage and salary jobs 2/	2,841	357	2,266	621	520	571	533	218
Construction	253	26	199	38	35	47	61	28
Manufacturing	1,418	151	1,200	366	171	288	247	67
Durable goods	956	106	799	281	102	183	155	51
Primary metal industries	98	14	77	40	5	25	5	7
Steel 3/	78	14	59	33	3	16	5	4
Other primary metals	20	-	18	7	2	9	-	2
Fabricated metal products	102	12	81	30	6	21	16	9
Machinery, except electrical	244	17	215	77	36	58	40	12
Electrical machinery	96	10	84	26	12	16	22	1
Transportation equipment	219	30	174	66	32	42	34	14
Automobiles	141	19	117	43	26	21	28	7
Other transportation equipment	77	11	58	23	6	21	6	7
Nondurable goods	464	45	401	85	69	105	92	16
Transportation and public utilities	191	15	154	40	72	44	27	22
Wholesale and retail trade	399	72	296	81	61	78	65	31
Finance and service industries	378	58	270	48	65	83	74	50
Public administration	48	4	42	11	5	7	19	2
Other industries 4/	154	31	105	38	19	24	22	18

1/ Includes 21,000 persons who did not report earnings on lost job.

2/ Data refer to persons with tenure of three or more years who lost or left a full-time wage and salary job between January 1979 and January 1984 because of plant closings or moves, slack work, or their positions or shifts were abolished.

3/ Includes blast furnaces, steelworks, rolling and finishing mills, and iron and steel foundries.

4/ Includes a small number who did not report industry.

Representative HAWKINS. In terms of those who were employed or reemployed in services, do you have a breakdown of what services are included? You said that one in every eight gained jobs in business services. Then you say much of this growth has been in personal supply and data processing services. We have no idea of how those services compared with manufacturing jobs, whether or not they were low paying or higher paying jobs. Would you count those two as both things?

Ms. NORWOOD. Many of those jobs are both, you know, there are all kinds of jobs in the business service sectors. Many of them are high-paying jobs. Some of them, of course, are not. It is, I think, rather difficult to look at that without specific occupational wage information. And we have been trying to do that in the Bureau, and I'm pleased that we will be able to expand some of that work in the future.

Representative HAWKINS. Now in terms of another force that is happening, especially in the Southwest, due to immigration, there's a tremendous increase in the number of undocumented workers in the Southwest. Their visibility is not always apparent. Many of them live in alleyways. Families, many families double up. I'm sure the census will never discover them. I'm wondering whether or not in your household survey, in the surveys that you conduct, whether or not there is an unknown factor of these individuals who are usually not visible to anyone except those who are familiar with those communities. I know that there is a tremendous number of blacks, black males, who are always overlooked. They could be on a slow boat to China, as far as any survey is concerned. And there's some areas where the surveyors never go into, because for cultural reasons, they just don't penetrate.

Now to what extent is this apparent to you in the surveys that you conduct?

Ms. NORWOOD. We have reviewed with some care, in a number of different ways, the problems, both of the undercount of the census and of the problem of undocumented workers, illegal immigration, as well as people who are employed, but who are off the book, for one reason or another, to evade taxation or for some other reason. It is really very difficult to get a handle that we can all rely on in that area. We do believe, however, that in general, we get from the household survey a great deal of that information.

We did a study recently examining all the estimates that had been made by private researchers of the amount that had been missed in wages, prices, productivity, and employment. We found that most of those people who come up with the estimates do not really understand the manner in which the surveys are conducted and the safeguards that we have and the kind of probing questions that we have. I would not want you to think that I believe there is no problem at all here. There is a problem, but I think it is not of the magnitude that some estimates that have been published would make us believe. This is an issue that most of the developed and even some of the developing countries of the world are interested in.

We have been discussing this problem at a working party of employment and unemployment that I chair at the OECD, which meets once a year to try to keep up with new techniques, and we're doing the best job we can with it.

There are other issues that I'm sure you, in particular, are very much aware of. I met recently in Texas with the Governors' Committee looking at economic development. And as you know, along with the Mexican border, they have very, very high unemployment rates. The difficulty is that the more they attract industry, the more people come across the border. And so it's kind of being on a treadmill to create jobs in that area, and yet once the jobs are there, people tend to move in, generally undocumented workers.

So there are parts of the country where that is a very special kind of problem, and it's very difficult to deal with.

Representative Hawkins. I don't want to continue to ask these questions and delay you, but just to conclude, at least, my questioning.

There are several other groups that I'm concerned about as to whether or not they are recognized. One is the economy which doesn't appear to be visible. That is, individuals in the underworld who are not actually gainfully employed, but employed in their own way. How is this group—it is my understanding, and I've seen estimates that place it as high as several million, 2 or 3 million persons, how are these individuals treated for the purpose of determining their status as unemployed?

Ms. Norwood. Well, as you know, Congressman Hawkins, we have two surveys. One survey is based on payroll records. If a person is not on the payroll record, that person does not appear in that survey, but the other survey, the household survey, in that survey, we try to include everyone, whether the activity is illegal or not, whether the person is in the country legally or illegally. We cannot give you specific information about the numbers, because, for obvious reasons, we do not go to a household and say, are you really here illegally, or are you engaged in some illegal work?

We do believe, however, that using some of the survey techniques that we have, that we are getting a lot of people who probably are engaged in activities that they might not report in other cases.

Representative Hawkins. You're missing a lot too.

Ms. Norwood. We may well be missing a lot, and on the other hand, as I said earlier, the study that we've done of the way in which these estimates of the kind you spoke of before were derived, they don't stand up at all. That does not mean that we don't have a problem. It means, I think that we can't quantify the extent of the problem.

Representative Hawkins. Thank you very much, and Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Representative Obey [presiding]. Ms. Norwood, there are a number of questions that Senator Proxmire wanted to ask for the record. I'll submit them, and if you'll provide responses, I'll appreciate it.

Ms. Norwood. We'll be glad to.

Representative Obey. Thank you very much for coming.

Ms. Norwood. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 10:39 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

[The following additional written questions and answers were subsequently supplied for the record:]

Response of Hon. Janet L. Norwood to Additional Written Questions Posed by Senator Proxmire

Question 1. This morning's Wall Street Journal reports: "Retailers generally reported small sales gains for February as merchants struggled to reduce big inventories left over from last year's sluggish holiday selling season."

What does this mean for future employment growth in the wholesale and retail trades? Could this mean future declines in consumer goods production and employment?

Answer. Both retail sales and inventories are extremely volatile on a month-to-month basis and preliminary estimates for both are often subject to large revisions. If retail sales were to slow down significantly for a long period, of course this would tend to have a depressing effect on employment. However, the outlook studies I have seen—DRI, Wharton, etc.—continue to forecast real growth in consumption in 1985. There are also indications that retailers have been keeping a close eye on inventories and making considerable effort to control their inventory-to-sales ratios.

Question 2. You report that the level and rate of unemployment have changed little since last May. This means that for the better part of a year, 8 and one-half million Americans were out of work and that the unemployment rate remained above 7 percent.

In your expert view, has the so-called "full employment" level of unemployment increased from the 4 percent level of 20 years ago to over 7 percent today? If this is so, how do you explain it?

Answer. The "full employment" unemployment rate is generally interpreted to mean the unemployment rate at which further stimulation to the economy would run the risk of stimulating inflation. While economists do not agree fully as to what that precise rate is, there is general agreement that the rate has been trending upward. In the mid-1950's, economists generally believed that the rate was about 3 percent. By the early 1960's the goal was changed to 4 percent. The 1973 Economic Report of the President stated that, ". . . it probably lies between 6 and 7 percent." I am attaching an article on this subject written a few years ago by several BLS staff members. The article discusses some of the reasons for the upward trend.

Question 3. This month's data show that once again the manufacturing industries' recovery lags far behind that of the service sectors' recovery. How much of the difference in the rate of recovery can you attribute to the increased importance of foreign made goods?

Answer. Imports of manufactured goods are having an effect on the overall economy and on particular industries. Employment in several industries has been declining for a number of years. In some, like apparel, the employment lost during the recession has not yet been regained. Others, such as blast furnaces and basic steel and textile mill products, have had employment continuing to decline even after the recession trough. There are many reasons for the changes in the competitive position of these industries; their problems cannot all be attributed to imports.

Imports have exerted a downward pull on inflation, and, in fact, some studies have shown that increased imports have been an important factor in slowing down the rate of increase in prices, a slowdown that has had a positive effect on the economy.

Question 4. Since the manufacturing industries are concentrated in the East and Midwest and those industries have had little or no employment growth in almost a year, could you compare the rates of change in employment and unemployment over the past 9 months by region of the country?

Answer. The following table shows employment and unemployment for the nine Census divisions in January 1984 and January 1985. These are the most recent data available. Because these data are not adjusted for seasonality, comparisons are limited to changes from the same month a year earlier.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY CENSUS DIVISION, JANUARY 1984–JANUARY 1985

	United States	New England	Middle Atlantic	East North Central	West North Central	South Atlantic	East South Central	West South Central	Mountain	Pacific
Employment (thousands):										
January 1984	101,270	5,963	15,569	17,420	7,740	17,006	5,881	11,030	5,457	14,756
January 1985	104,344	6,174	16,070	17,944	7,892	17,706	6,105	11,206	5,683	15,426
Percent change	3.0	3.5	3.3	3.0	2.0	4.1	3.8	1.6	4.1	4.5
Unemployment (thousands):										
January 1984	9,755	432	1,467	2,117	666	1,395	743	985	458	1,555
January 1985	9,131	340	1,294	1,986	643	1,317	697	970	445	1,435
Percent change	−6.4	−21.4	−11.8	−6.2	−3.6	−5.6	−6.3	−1.6	−2.7	−7.7
Unemployment rate (%):										
January 1984	8.8	6.8	8.6	10.8	7.9	7.6	11.2	8.2	7.7	9.5
January 1985	8.0	5.2	7.4	10.0	7.5	6.9	10.2	8.0	7.3	8.5

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics Program, March 1985.

Question 5. As you know, the President has decided not to ask the Japanese to continue their voluntary restraints on the number of cars they export to the United States. As our expert on both consumer prices and employment, could you estimate the effects of a 500,000 increase in the number of Japanese cars imported into the United States on auto prices and domestic auto industry employment?

Answer. I cannot provide an estimate in response to your question. In general, we know that increased imports and greater competition tend to lower prices. The effect of a lower rate of inflation tends to make more income available for other purposes which could stimulate new demand for other goods and services and thus increase employment. It may well be that a fall in price could even increase the overall demand for cars and other goods.

The relationships involved in assessing these issues are extremely complex, and the work cannot be done with the statistical accuracy required for a BLS product. For this reason, the BLS does not make estimates in this field.

Several studies on this subject have been made, however. Three of these studies that have been called to my attention are:

"Import Quotas and the Automobile Industry: The Costs of Protectionism" by Robert W. Crandall, Brookings Review, Summer 1984.

"Aggregate Costs to the United States of Tariffs and Quotas on Imports," by David G. Tarr and Morris E. Morkre, Bureau of Economics Staff Report to the Federal Trade Commission, December 1984.

"A Review of Recent Developments in the U.S. Automobile Industry Including an Assessment of the Japanese Voluntary Restraint Agreements," United States International Trade Commission publication 1648, February 1985.

A review of these studies indicates general agreement that the voluntary restraint agreements (VRA) have affected both domestic and Japanese auto sales and prices in the United States market, United States employment levels, and United States consumer costs. All of the studies agree that the costs of the VRAs to the United States consumer are very large. The estimates of the employment gain resulting from the VRA appear to differ widely. Of course, all the estimates are highly dependent on the assumptions made and the time period covered. The range of the employment estimates illustrates the difficulty in trying to develop precise estimates of the impact of the VRAs.

What is a current equivalent to unemployment rates of the past?

The results of various attempts to quantify how much changes in the labor force, unemployment insurance, and minimum wages have affected unemployment rates are reasonably close; but no total effect on jobless rates can be determined

JOSEPH ANTOS, WESLEY MELLOW,
AND JACK E. TRIPLETT

The economic recovery which began in 1975 focused attention once more on the "full employment" target for U.S. macroeconomic policy. During the mid-1950's, economists generally believed that when 3 percent of the labor force was unemployed the economy had used up the slack in resources and further stimulation would risk breeding inflation. By the early 1960's, the generally accepted full employment goal was changed to 4 percent on the belief that this figure represented "frictional" unemployment, and thus the practical minimum level of unemployment that could be reached with conventional fiscal and monetary policy. Recently, however, a number of economists have argued that various changes in the economy have pushed the "full-employment unemployment rate" to values higher than the traditional 4 percent.

A number of articles have appeared which have attempted to quantify the effects on the unemployment rate of one or more of the economic changes which have occurred over the past 15 or 20 years. We have surveyed the major articles on this subject, and review their findings and methodologies in this article. Before going into this analysis, the following interpretive points must be made:

1. Computing the current unemployment rate that is comparable to (say) a 4-percent rate 15 or 20 years ago is *not* the same thing as determining the noninflationary rate in today's economy, even if 4 percent was the noninflationary rate in the earlier period. The reason is that inflation depends on a number of factors in addition to the wage-cost pressures embodied in traditional Phillips curve analysis, including pressures on capacity (which may generate upward movement in nonlabor costs), external shocks (such as energy or agricultural shortages), and inflationary expectations. If decisionmakers, buyers, and so forth, build into contracts, purchase orders, and other decisions some expected inflation rate, then the unemployment rate corresponding to price stability will be higher than it would be if inflationary expectations were absent. Thus the noninflationary unemployment rate will shift with changes in expectations (as well as the other factors mentioned above); accordingly, one cannot determine the noninflationary unemployment rate solely from analysis of labor market effects. Some recent literature acknowledges this point by speaking of the full-employment unemployment rate as the rate which will not *accelerate* the rate of inflation.

2. In the absence of a comprehensive, integrated study of the comparability question, it is necessary to combine the results of independent studies on factors such as changes in labor force composition, unemployment insurance, minimum wages, and so

---

Joseph Antos and Wesley Mellow are economists in the Office of Research Methods and Standards, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Jack E. Triplett is Assistant Commissioner of that office.

Reprinted from March 1979
Monthly Labor Review

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Bureau of Labor Statistics

forth. Interaction effects, however, cause serious analytic problems. There are two categories of these effects:

First, there are interactions among the variables studied (as, for example, when a change in a social or governmental program also influences labor force composition, and separate estimates are computed for the impact on unemployment of the program change and the change in the composition of the labor force). In these cases, the whole may not be equal to the sum of the separately estimated effects.

Second, there are interactions between the variables studied and cyclical unemployment. Several of the factors discussed later in this article have a greater impact on the unemployment rate at less than full employment than they do at full employment. In these cases, finding the 1979 unemployment rate that is comparable to a 4-percent rate in earlier years is not the same thing as accounting for changes in the *actual* rates between those dates.

Unfortunately, it is seldom possible to extricate interaction effects from existing studies. In the absence of a research design that would account for interaction effects, we have grave reservations about adding up individual estimates obtained from independent studies in the attempt to compute a point estimate of a current unemployment rate which would be comparable to those of some past period. We believe the combined total would be considerably less accurate than the degree of accuracy the components would suggest.

3. Many relevant studies were not set up to permit translation of results into effects on the unemployment rate. For example, Edward Gramlich's minimum wage study, discussed later, estimates employment elasticities (to changes in the minimum) not estimates of *effects* on the unemployment rate. Accordingly, results of some studies on relevant variables were not incorporated in this article. In addition, some factors mentioned in various studies as contributing to the noncomparability question have not been analyzed in such a way as to permit their survey here.

Labor force composition effects

Conceptual and methodological considerations. Compositional effects have frequently been estimated by computing "weighted" unemployment rates; that is, applying the labor force proportions of some base period to the actual unemployment rates of various demographic groups in the comparison period. Such weighting exercises have been carried out by, among others, the Council of Economic Advisers, Philip Cagan, and Paul O. Flaim.[7] All the researchers used age-sex demographic groups, and Flaim included race as well. Results of the computations differ because of time spans covered and also because of varying degrees of disaggregation (from 10 demographic groups in Cagan's computation to 22 groups in Flaim's). Perhaps of more importance, however, the results were originally reported on different bases, because researchers have made different de[illegible] with respect to the interaction term inhere[illegible] a weighted unemployment rate analysis.

To clarify this point, consider the following definition. The change in the overall unemployment rate between some initial base year (*b*) and some other year (*t*) is composed of the factors in the following expression:

$$(1)\quad U^t = U^b + \sum_i (w_i^b \Delta u_i + u_i^b \Delta w_i + \Delta u_i \Delta w_i),$$

$$\text{or (1.a)}\quad U^t - U^b = \sum_i (w_i^b \Delta u_i + u_i^b \Delta w_i + \Delta u_i \Delta w_i),$$

where U^b and U^t are overall unemployment rates, w_i is the labor force proportion of the *i*th demographic group, u_i is the unemployment rate for that same group, and Δ indicates the change in the appropriate variable between periods *b* and *t*. Of course, the two unemployment rates U^b and U^t are defined by:

$$(2)\quad U^b = \sum_i w_i^b u_i^b$$

$$U^t = \sum_i w_i^t u_i^t$$

In most of the literature on this subject, the "weighted" unemployment rate that has been computed to analyze the compositional question consists of:

$$(3)\quad \text{"weighted" } U = \sum_i w_i^b u_i^t = U^b + \sum_i (w_i^b \Delta u_i),$$

that is, a computation incorporating only the first term from the bracketed terms of equation (1). However, as a measure of the effect of the change in labor force composition, this is strictly correct only if the interaction term $(\Delta u_i \Delta w_i)$, the last bracketed term in equation (1), is close to zero and empirically it is not. The importance of this is indicated by the following economic interpretation of the separate terms of equation (1.a).

The first term $(\sum w_i^b \Delta u_i)$ gives the change in the overall unemployment rate that would have occurred had labor force proportions remained unchanged and had unemployment rates applicable to specific age-sex groups changed as they actually did. We refer to this as the "pure cyclical effect."

Of course, part of the change in actual age-sex specific unemployment rates was probably caused by changing labor force composition (for example, a larger cohort of young workers implies a "crowding" effect in that grouping, and a consequent rise in the youth unemployment rate, unless the number of entry-level jobs expands sufficiently).[3] Therefore, in the real economy, labor force *proportions* and specific unemployment *rates* are interrelated. This change in demographic unemployment rates associated with changing labor force proportions is part of the interaction term.

The second term of equation (1.a)— $\Sigma a_i^0 \Delta w_i$ — may be interpreted as the change in the overall unemployment rate that would have occurred if demographic unemployment rates had remained unchanged when labor force proportions changed. In table 1, this is referred to as the "direct compositional effect." This computation does not measure any change in labor force proportions caused by changes in demographic unemployment rates, an effect which would be introduced through labor force participation rates via what is usually referred to as the "discouraged worker" effect. This effect (or rather, the relative sizes of the discouraged worker effects for different demographic groups) is also a portion of the interaction term.

Thus, the final term in equation (1.a), the interaction term ($\Sigma \Delta a_i \Delta w_i$) is composed of the "crowding" effect on age-specific unemployment rates and the discouraged worker effect on labor force participation rates (and hence on labor force proportions). Disentangling the two effects cannot be done through a mechanical procedure such as equation (1), which is simply a mathematical truism, but requires a more sophisticated investigation of economic behavior than has so far been carried out.

Two further observations are appropriate. First, the interaction term is large, relative to the other terms of equation (1.a), so the above discussion is of considerable importance in interpreting the results. Empirically, the interaction term seems to be half or more the size of the "direct" compositional effect computed from equation (1.a). *Thus, the way the interaction term is handled makes a great amount of difference in the determination of the "comparable" unemployment rate.*

Second, there is no absolutely correct way to handle the interaction term, precisely because it is an interaction effect attributable to both changes in labor force proportion and changes in age-sex specific unemployment rates. Some computations of "weighted" unemployment rates have ignored it, which is equivalent to the economic assumption that there is no "crowding" and there are no "discouraged workers." On the other hand, the

Table 1. Estimates of the effect of changes in labor force composition on the unemployment rate, various periods

[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	Comments
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
CEA [illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible]			[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]				[illegible] [illegible]	[illegible]

[illegible]

whole interaction effect cannot be added in to either of the two weighted unemployment rates that could be computed from the first two terms of equation (1.a) precisely because it belongs, in undetermined proportions, to both. Arbitrarily splitting the interaction term among the two rates is not appropriate either. The only appropriate way to present the results is to report direct compositional effects and interactions terms separately, and this is the way it is handled in table 1.

The estimates. Table 1 summarizes several estimates of the effect of changes in labor force composition using fixed-weight unemployment rates. Entries in the table indicate the magnitude of the effects of changes in labor force composition over the designated period. For example, Cagan estimates that the direct compositional effect added 0.46 percentage points to the full-employment unemployment rate between 1956 and 1973. Allowing for different periods covered by the estimates, agreement appears close. All three estimates of the "sum" (col. 3) for the year 1973 lie around 0.7 percentage points.

We prefer, however, to focus on the separate estimates of direct compositional and interaction effects because of the preceding analysis which argued that the sum of the two is undoubtedly an overstatement of the impact of labor force composition on the overall rate. The two estimates of the direct compositional effect put it at around half a point with the difference between the two undoubtedly attributable to the continued change in labor force composition between 1973 and 1976.

The only anomaly in table 1 relates to the size of the interaction term, which is considerably larger in Flaim's estimate than in Cagan's. The reason for this may be the fact that Flaim used more demographic groups, thus giving more leeway for interaction effects to show up. On the other hand, higher 1976 unemployment rates may show up disproportionately in the interaction term.

Taking account of the interpretative problems posed by the interaction term, application of the "fixed-weight" unemployment rate methodology leads to the following tentative conclusion: Changes in labor force composition appear to have added from one-half (the direct compositional effect) to one percentage point (the outside limit if the full interaction term is included) to the unemployment rate for 1976, compared to its value 20 years earlier.

Alternative methodologies. A major motivation for computing fixed-weight unemployment rates is a desire to obtain a better *summary measure* of excess supply in labor markets than is provided by the official BLS rate. Though the concept of a *measure* of excess supply or excess demand is not very well defined in economics (at either the operational or theoretical levels), and methods for aggregating excess supply measures for individual labor markets into a *simple* summary measure for the economy are even less well understood, it is still appropriate to try to sharpen the notion of aggregate labor market excess supply by making reference to a more tightly defined concept. This, in our interpretation, is what George Perry and Michael Wachter attempt to do.

Perry adjusts a measure of lost hours for estimated hourly earnings (both expressed relative to the values applicable to prime-age males). Thus, his unemployment measure (U^P) is closely related (though not precisely equivalent) to a measure of earnings lost by unemployed labor. Though a measure of the economic loss due to unemployment is valuable, and may be defended as a better measure for the purpose Perry puts it to, the published BLS unemployment rate has never measured economic loss due to unemployment, so we cannot use changes in Perry's measure to evaluate the comparability of changes in the official BLS unemployment rate over time. As presented in Wachter, U^P moved from 3.5 in 1956 to 7.1 in 1975, but that does not imply that the equivalent BLS unemployment rate was 7.1.[3]

Perry's unemployment measure has been used as a proxy for excess demand in wage equations of the Phillips curve type, but it requires strong assumptions to argue that a wage-weighted measure of excess labor supply is the best construction for this purpose. Wachter's normalized unemployment rate (U_N) was constructed explicitly to meet this need.

Wachter's rate (U_N) is built up from age-sex groups' specific rates which are estimated from a statistical analysis, rather than from a weighting scheme. A regression is used to establish the relation between actual age-sex specific rates and the rate for prime-age males, at the same time controlling for changes in the age distribution of the population. (The objective is to capture the impact on age-sex specific rates of factors such as the postwar baby boom coming into the labor market.) Then, on the twin assumptions that the "noninflationary" or "full-employment" rate for prime-age males is 2.9 *and constant over time*, "normalized" unemployment rates are computed for each age-sex group by plugging the 2.9 value back into the regression. The estimated age-sex specific rates are then aggregated into the overall

U_N figure, using current labor force proportions for each year.

The procedure has been criticized[4] but a detailed presentation of these criticisms would depart from the purpose of this article. However, three points should be made:

1. Wachter refers to his U_N as a "full employment unemployment rate" in the sense that it permits developing a figure which "denotes the same labor market tightness over time." Such an objective (a better measure of "labor market tightness") undoubtedly lies behind other attempts to adjust the unemployment rate in some fashion, so Wachter's U_N may be regarded as a relatively sophisticated attempt to get around the economic inadequacy of mechanical procedures such as fixed-weighting schemes.

2. Whether the measure is successful in doing what Wachter intends it to do is clearly debatable. He is duly cautious: "Unfortunately, few of the variables that are likely to affect the normalized unemployment rate can be easily quantified with the precision needed to estimate their impact on it. . . . Hence the U_N measure of this paper is a crude proxy."[5]

3. Though U_N is developed as a measure to determine a noninflationary unemployment rate *for analyzing wage inflation*, there is no reason to believe that this measure defines uniquely an unemployment rate that can be used to target economic policy, essentially for the reason noted earlier in this article and stressed so often by Milton Friedman, Edmund Phelps, Phillip Cagan, and others.[6] The noninflationary unemployment rate depends crucially on price expectations, as well as other economic factors.

Unemployment insurance

Many researchers have studied the impact that the unemployment insurance (UI) system has on unemployment, particularly duration of unemployment. Hamermesh analyzed 12 empirical studies on the topic and concluded that *for those receiving UI benefits* duration of unemployment is longer by about 2.5 weeks, and concluded that the UI system "induces an extra 0.51 percentage points of unemployment, through its effect on duration."[7] Other researchers reach similar conclusions. In his study for the Joint Economic Committee, Martin Feldstein calculated that the total impact of the UI system increased the unemployment rate by 1.25 percentage points — 0.75 as a result of increased duration.[8]

However, for present purposes the relevant question is: "What effect have changes in the UI system had on the unemployment rate?" and not, "What is the total effect of the UI system on the unemployment rate?" This is so because the 1956 unemployment rate was higher than it would have been had the UI system not existed then. Since 1956, the ratio of average UI benefits to average weekly earnings has increased by only 2.7 percentage points, so that a major part of the effect of the UI system on unemployment rates probably occurred prior to 1956.[9]

Table 2. Estimates of the effects of changes in the unemployment insurance system on the noncyclical unemployment rate, 1956–77

Source of change	Change in rate
Increased coverage	+.14
Change in magnitude of benefits	(1)
Supplemental Insurance Assistance Program (inclusion of seasonal workers)	+.20
1974–75 extension of maximum weeks benefits may be paid	(1)
Total effect	+.34

[1] Not applicable to noncyclical computation.

SOURCE: Phillip Cagan, "The Reduction of Inflation and the Magnitude of Unemployment," *Contemporary Economic Problems* (Washington, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1977), p. 38.

One study that does investigate the effect of changes in the UI system on the unemployment rate is that of Cagan (summarized in table 2). Cagan analyzes the following changes in the UI system since 1956: (1) Increases in the percentage of workers in the labor force who are covered by the UI system. He calculates the increase in covered workers over the period, applies typical estimates of the effect UI has on duration, and concludes that increased coverage increased the unemployment rate by 0.14 percentage point through its effect on duration. He made no allowance for any effect on unemployment incidence. (2) Increases in the magnitude of benefits could affect both the duration and incidence of unemployment. The increase in benefit levels since the late 1950's has been extremely modest: the ratio of benefits to average earnings increased only 2.7 percentage points. Consequently, Cagan ignores this as a source of possible influence on unemployment. (3) The Supplemental Insurance Assistance Program enacted in 1975 which extended coverage to many workers in seasonal industries (such as schoolteachers). Here, Cagan cites Alfred Tella's rough estimate that the program resulted in a 0.20-percentage-point increase in the unemployment rate. (4) Finally, Cagan ignores the 1974 and 1975 extensions of the time for receiving benefits, arguing that since such extensions occur only in times of high unemployment their effect on the rate when unemployment is low would be minor.

To summarize, Cagan estimates that changes in the UI system over the past 20 years have increased the noncyclical unemployment rate 0.34 percentage point. However, as Cagan[10] points out, changes in the UI system may also increase the incidence of unemployment, but "there exists no accurate estimate of how much they increase it."

Minimum wages

Among the large number of studies of the economic effect of minimum wage laws, three studies (Jacob Mincer, Hyman B. Kaitz, and James F. Ragan, Jr.)[11] have used similar methodologies to estimate the effect of changes in minimum wages on the unemployment rates for demographic groups. (See table 3.) All have explicitly allowed for effects of withdrawal from the labor force (as well as disemployment impacts) and all used an "effective minimum wage" variable originally constructed by BLS.[12] The effective minimum wage expresses the minimum wage relative to a measure of average hourly earnings which is weighted for the proportion of employment covered under the minimum wage law.

Mincer's study found effects for young workers which substantially increased their unemployment rates (largest impacts were for men age 20-24 and for teenagers) with little impact on older workers. Cagan used Mincer's equations, combined with values for the effective minimum wage for 1974, to estimate that changes in the minimum wage from 1956 to 1974 contributed 0.63 percentage point to unemployment rates.

Kaitz and Ragan ran regressions not dissimilar to Mincer's for more detailed categories within the teenage group. Ragan's more disaggregated regressions imply smaller estimates of unemployment among teenagers than one would obtain from Mincer's regressions. (Hence, plugging Ragan's equations into the calculation performed by Cagan would have decreased Cagan's estimate of the effect of minimum wage changes on the overall unemployment rate to about 0.35 percentage point.) By comparison, the earlier study by Kaitz found very little effect. We feel that the Kaitz conclusion is probably less in disagreement with the others than may at first appear because of the following:

1. There was very little trend in the effective minimum wage variable between the 1956 minimum wage changes and those that went into effect in 1967 and 1968. Therefore, the period studied by Kaitz (1954-68) ends at about the time the effects estimated by Ragan begin to show up.

2. Kaitz recognized that Government training programs had an effect on teenage unemployment that offset, to a great degree, the 1967 and 1968 minimum wage changes. Kaitz also recognized econometric problems with his approach, and we believe Ragan's procedure for handling this problem is better than that of Kaitz. Accordingly, Ragan's estimates are preferable.

3. Kaitz found large withdrawal effects. Ragan handles part of the withdrawal from the labor force problem by running separate regressions for teenagers enrolled in school. Again, Ragan's later work is an improvement on the pioneering effort by Kaitz.

Thus, these three studies are in rough agreement on the size of the effect of minimum wage changes on the unemployment rate, though Cagan's com-

Table 3. Studies[1] of the effect of increases in the minimum wage on the unemployment rate, various periods 1954–74

Name	Period	Groups for which results computed	Range of estimates	Comments
Mincer	1954-69	[illegible] demographic groups	[illegible] to [illegible] for teens and young workers [illegible] to [illegible] for older workers	Computed from separate regressions for employment and labor force effects. No overall estimate.
Cagan	1956-74	overall rate	0.63 overall	Extrapolated Mincer's results to 1974 and combined the impacts for most affected groups (youth) to form an estimate of the impact on the overall unemployment rate.
Kaitz	1954-68	8 teenage demographic groups	Net effect is essentially no change	Estimated separate employment and labor force equations (as did Mincer), but estimated unemployment effects directly from another regression. Found substantial labor force withdrawals, which offset disemployment effects.
Ragan	[illegible]	[illegible] teenage demographic	[illegible] to [illegible] for [illegible] groups [illegible] for total teenagers Implies an increase in overall unemployment rate of about 0.35	Refers only to the effect of 1966 minimum wage changes on 1972 teenage unemployment rates. (However, there was very little change in effective minimum wage rates from 1956 to 1966, so may be taken as an estimate of the effect from 1956 to 1972 on teenage unemployment rates.) Computed from regressions similar to those of Kaitz; improved specification and separate regressions for teenagers enrolled in school may account for difference in findings.

[1] [illegible]

putation of the effect on the overall rate may be a little high in the sense that his 0.63 would have been smaller had he substituted Ragan's (more recent) teenage estimates for those of Mincer (but retaining Mincer's finding of large unemployment effects for men age 20-24, a group which was not studied by Ragan).

A different kind of study was done by Edward Gramlich[13] who, as noted, estimated employment elasticities, rather than effects on the unemployment rate. However, if persons disemployed by the minimum wage withdraw from the labor force, employment elasticities cannot be used to estimate the effect on the unemployment rate. Moreover, Gramlich's minimum wage variable is the ratio of the statutory minimum to a *price* measure (real minimum wages), rather than relating the nominal minimum to other wages. If the minimum wage causes substitution of high wage for low wage workers (which Gramlich's own regressions suggest), then surely the minimum wage should have been related to a measure of other wages. Nevertheless, taking all of his regressions together, Gramlich finds that young workers are losers from minimum wage increases, not primarily because they are disemployed, but mainly because they are moved into part-time employment. This and his other findings are broadly consistent with the magnitudes and directions of the effects found in the Mincer study cited earlier.

A final, and quite different, study of the effect of minimum wages, is one done by Marvin Kosters and Finis Welch,[14] who emphasize the distinction between cyclical unemployment and other types. It is well known that employment of teenagers and low-skilled workers fluctuates more than does that of skilled adult male workers. Kosters and Welch found that the minimum wage exacerbated these differing cyclical patterns:

> Our evidence indicates that increases in the effective minimum wage over the period 1954-68 have had . . . the effect of . . . increasing vulnerability to cyclical changes in employment for the group most 'marginal' to the work force—teenagers. . . . And a disproportionate share of these unfavorable employment effects appears to have accrued to nonwhite teenagers.[15]

Applying their conclusions to the other studies cited in table 3 suggests that the minimum wage impact estimated by Cagan may be too *high* partly because those studies do not fully allow for the stage of the business cycle (or unemployment level) effects; that is, they estimate what is (roughly) an average effect over the cycle. Because recent unemployment rates are so much higher than those experienced over the 1954-72 period covered in those studies, their results imply a substantially higher impact on the 1978 unemployment rate of minimum wage changes, though also implying that at low rates of overall unemployment, the minimum wage effect on unemployment would be much lower than Cagan's estimate given in table 3. As we are concerned with the comparability of the *full-employment* rate, Kosters and Welch's findings suggest that Cagan's estimate is too high.

At this point it is worth noting once again the role of the interaction effects emphasized at the beginning of the article.

1. If minimum wage changes cause withdrawals from the labor force, this obviously affects labor force composition, the effects of which were studied separately. Because in this case minimum wage-induced withdrawal serves to *reduce* the labor force composition estimates below what they would otherwise be (because the worker groups most affected have grown relative to other population groups), we infer that the combined effect of changes in minimum wages and in labor force composition would probably be greater than the separately estimated effects.

2. Kosters and Welch argue that the minimum wage serves to increase the cyclical swings in teenage unemployment. This interaction between a public policy and business cycle developments makes it difficult to specify precisely what "comparability" in unemployment rates would encompass.

Another factor not considered in any of the studies discussed thus far is J. Wilson Mixon's suggestion[16] that offsetting adjustments in fringe benefits and working conditions may reduce the direct employment effects of the minimum wage, so that the ultimate effect shows up in a more complex way—through changes in turnover rates, as one instance—than envisioned in other existing studies. Differences in turnover rates among different demographic groups have often been cited as the reasons for differences in age and sex specific unemployment rates.[17] The Mixon hypothesis about the economic impact of the minimum wage thus suggests an interaction effect with the demographic composition effects surveyed earlier. There is no existing information on the magnitude of this effect.

Considering results of all the minimum wage studies, plus probable interaction effects, we conclude that there are both upward and downward biases operating on the 0.6-percentage point estimate of the effect of the minimum wage that Cagan compiled, based on Mincer's work. We can thus have no great confidence in the accuracy of this number, because we are unable at present to quantify these biases in order to take them into account in the estimate.

Other factors

As part of this review, we need to discuss certain factors influencing changes in the overall rate that have been mentioned in a variety of sources.

Multiworker families. An unemployed person may have less financial pressure and thus take longer to accept a new job if other members of his family are employed. Because the proportion of multiworker families has risen over the past 20 years, this factor has been hypothesized as contributing to a rise in measured unemployment. We can get a rough idea of the size of this effect by examining the influence of other family members' earnings on an unemployed individual's job search behavior.

In a recent study, John M. Barron and Wesley Mellow[18] used data taken from the May 1976 Current Population Survey supplement on the jobseeking behavior of the unemployed to estimate a model of intensity of search effort; that is, hours spent looking for work. Their model includes as explanatory variables demographic characteristics, reason for unemployment, and unemployment insurance benefits, as well as variables indicating family income from welfare payments and the earnings of other family members. It is estimated that unemployed workers in families containing another employed member spend about 10 percent fewer hours per week looking for work.[19]

To translate an effect on time spent searching into an unemployment rate impact, we need to know how job search affects the probability of finding work. As an upper bound estimate, we assume that a given percent increase in hours per week spent searching for work implies an equivalent percent increase in the probability of becoming employed. In other words, if hours per week spent searching increases by 10 percent, we assume the probability of finding a job also increases by 10 percent. This yields an estimate of 0.42 percentage points for the *total* impact of multiworker families on the 1976 unemployment rate.[20]

What we want, of course, is an estimate of the impact of *change* in the proportion of multiworker families over the 1956–76 period. As this proportion has moved from 38.3 percent of families with members in the labor force in 1956 to 52.9 percent in 1976, we adjust the 0.42 figure for this change. This results in an estimate that an increasing proportion of multiworker families was responsible for only 0.12 percentage points of the higher unemployment rate of 1976. Thus, the multiworker family effect on the overall unemployment rate appears to be modest. Of course, the increase in multiworker families over the period may have increased the *incidence* of unemployment as well as its duration. We have no direct evidence on this.

Social programs. Increased welfare payments of various kinds might make not working more attractive than working at low-paying jobs, and thereby increase the number of people who are counted as unemployed. We know of no estimates of the effects of welfare programs, as such, on the unemployment rate. Most of the discussion about the unemployment rate effect of these programs has focused instead on the fact that some of them (Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Food Stamps) have recently instituted mandatory work registration of some kind (at least for some participants).

Mandatory work registration might change the *measured* unemployment rate because it forces people who were not previously looking for work to begin looking (in which case the change in the measured unemployment rate is correct, although for the purposes of the present inquiry we would still want to eliminate the effect to maintain comparability over time). Alternatively, it might induce people who were not really interested in working to report themselves to the Current Population Survey (CPS) as looking for work because they were afraid that correct reporting would somehow jeopardize their eligibility for welfare payments. The latter idea seems at the root of most of the discussion of the subject; that is, the idea that registration requirements have not produced changes in economic behavior (labor force participation), only a measurement error in the official unemployment series. Obviously, evaluation of this probability requires information on how mandatory work registration influences *the way people respond to the CPS survey*, but no studies have produced direct information on survey response.

In its 1976 *Annual Report*, the Council of Economic Advisers reported that when welfare mothers were required to register for work, their specific unemployment rate increased by 5.8 points (from 5.7 percent to 11.5 percent).[21] Cagan translated this into a 0.2 increase in the overall unemployment rate.

The Council's estimate, however, was obtained from administrative records of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program and refers to the number of program recipients reclassified from "out of the labor force" to "unemployed" status by welfare administrators after passage of the work registration requirement. The legislation itself required welfare administrators to determine which welfare recipients were capable of holding jobs; one would expect this more careful examination, alone, to result in transfers out of the "not in the labor force" status, even in the absence of work registration (simply because it focused attention on making a more precise definition of potential employability and labor market status). In some cases, for example, mothers might have already regarded themselves as looking for work (hence, unemployed), so that the change in AFDC records reflects more accuracy in recording labor market status in those records, rather than a change in the welfare recipient's own perception of her status, or any change in the measured unemployment rate. Moreover, having decided that a welfare recipient was capable of working, and hence should be forced to register for work, the only consistent labor force classification for the administrator to make is "unemployed."

The question for the measured unemployment rate, however, is not the welfare administrator's response to mandatory work registration, but the effect of the registration on the welfare recipient's own perception of her labor market status, and its effect on her response to the CPS query. It is reasonable to presume that work registration will produce *some* change in survey response, but it is extremely doubtful that *all* persons reclassified by administrators will reclassify themselves when they are included in the Current Population Survey. (Indeed, the 11.5-percent unemployment rate reported in the AFDC administrative records is really a count of the number of employable, but not currently working, mothers receiving AFDC.) For this reason, we believe that Cagan's 0.2-percentage point estimate for the effect of AFDC work requirements on the unemployment rate is too high.

In a widely circulated study, Kenneth W. Clarkson and Roger E. Meiners reached a far higher figure (2.4 percentage points) for the effect of all welfare program work registration requirements.[22] The authors essentially jumped to this conclusion from observing the size of the change in the unemployment rate in the past several years (years in which work registration requirements were instituted), buttressing the argument with counts of persons in the affected programs. Their data have little, if anything, to say about the measured unemployment rate, and amount to little more than unsubstantiated speculation, which (as shown in analyses by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Congressional Budget Office) is far from convincing. Cagan cites the study but does not use its results, a judgment which we follow in the present article.

Government training programs. A training program can have several impacts on the unemployment rate. It is well known that more highly skilled workers have lower unemployment rates, so a training program which succeeds in raising the skill level above what it otherwise would have been might be expected to lower unemployment rates of participants throughout their lifetimes, thereby producing a permanent reduction in the aggregate unemployment rate. The long-run effect of existing and past government training programs has been the subject of some debate, and we know of no studies which indicate whether they have reduced the long-run unemployment rate.

There is also a short-run impact. Some persons who are in training programs (and, therefore, classified as out of the labor force) would otherwise have been in the labor force and those who did not find employment would raise the unemployment rate. Attempts to examine the short-run impact have been done by Malcolm Cohen, Sylvia S. Small, and Ralph E. Smith.[23] All take the *previous labor market status* of program participants to define their *probable status* were they not in the program (though Smith, as noted later, modified this approach). Cohen and Small come up with a decrease in the unemployment rate of about 0.3 percentage point.

However, using this approach to estimate the effect on the overall unemployment rate assumes that when a worker leaves his job to enter a training program, *the number of jobs in the economy falls.* We assume, instead, that the total number of jobs in the economy is determined by conventional macroeconomic forces and is independent of whether a group of individuals enters into training programs (or, put another way, that when a worker enters into a training program his job is taken by someone else who would otherwise have been unemployed). Under this line of reasoning, the number of unemployed is reduced by the *entire number* of participants who were previously in the labor force—not just those who were previously unemployed—with appropriate adjustments (if any) for probable changes in labor force participation rates. This recalculation would *raise* the estimated impact on the unemployment rate substantially. Thus, Smith's downward adjustment to Small's estimate—for probable length of unemployment—is inappropriate, and adjusts the estimate in the wrong direction.

Changes in measurement and response. Changes in the Current Population Survey in 1967 and 1970 have been evaluated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Bureau of the Census. Paul O. Flaim judged the effects of the two changes to be offsetting, resulting in no net change in the overall unemployment rate.

Cagan quoted Alfred Tella[13] as arguing that survey response error has changed over time, and that this factor has lowered the unemployment rate by 0.1 points. Thus, the net effect of measurement and response changes is very small, with a possible small downward error being the best estimate.

Is there a current equivalent?

We have carried out a critical review of available research on factors which affect the comparability of recent unemployment rates with those of earlier periods. It is tempting to add up the quantitative results discussed and to treat the sum as an estimate of the change in the full-employment unemployment rate over the past two decades. Though we believe the results of the various studies cited are enlightening, it is not valid to combine these results to obtain an unemployment rate "comparable" to some earlier rate. Present research simply does not permit a very precise estimate of the *total* influence of all the factors discussed in this article. There are two compelling reasons for an agnostic position on this question: (1) A lack of confidence in the precision of estimated effects for the individual factors, and (2) major problems with the validity of *summing* the separate estimates of individual factors (primarily, unmeasured interaction effects among the various separate estimates).

Precision of estimates. For most of the factors which have been studied, we have reservations about the accuracy, precision, or validity of existing estimates. These reservations are summarized in Exhibit A, which lists two sources of imprecision: (1) Known errors in available estimates which tend to overstate the estimated effect of the particular factor studied, and (2) important aspects of some factors on the list have not been investigated in a setting which permits using research results to estimate comparable unemployment rates.

Exhibit A. Summary of biases in estimates of effects of noncyclical factors on the unemployment rate

Source	Direction of and reason for probable bias or error in estimates
1. Labor force composition	Uncertain: interaction term from fixed weight unemployment rate calculation cannot be partitioned accurately, and other methodologies do not yield estimates precisely comparable with the measured unemployment rate
2. UI benefits	Uncertain: probable upward bias to factors listed in table 2, but other UI influences on unemployment have not been studied
3. Minimum wage	Estimated effect too large, for reasons specified in text
4. Other factors:	
Multiworker family	Uncertain: incomplete data
Welfare programs	Estimated effect incomplete and therefore possibly too low
Government training programs	Estimated effect too small, for reasons discussed in text
Measurement	None, so far as known

Because we have no estimates of the size of the errors, nor of the extent to which they may or may not offset each other—we do not know the sign of the aggregate error or bias. We feel that adding up the existing factor estimates from the separate parts of this article would produce an aggregate figure in whose precision we would have little confidence.

Imprecision of summed totals. We have argued throughout this article that a number of factors that have been identified as affecting unemployment rate comparability interact with each other. Thus, for example, if the minimum wage affects the unemployment rate partially through the effects it has on the labor force for impacted groups, then it is proper to include those effects if the objective is to estimate only the minimum wage effect; it would be quite improper, however, to *add* such an estimate to an estimate of labor force composition effects obtained independently, because simple summation would in this case count part of the effect of the minimum wage rate twice.

We feel that labor market interactions are pervasive among the factors discussed in this article, so that *simple summation* of the separately estimated effects would lead to serious error. However, we do not rule out some form of combination, if the necessary information were available on the size of interaction effects. It is not at the present time. ☐

FOOTNOTES

[1] See Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers, 1976, and Annual Report, 1977; Phillip Cagan, "The Reduction of Inflation and the Magnitude of Unemployment," *Contemporary Economic Problems, 1977* (Washington, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 1977), pp. 15-52; and Paul O. Flaim, "The effect of demographic changes on the Nation's unemployment rate," *Monthly Labor Review*, March 1979, pp. 13-23.

[2] Michael Wachter, "The Demographic Impact on Unemployment: Past Experience and the Outlook for the Future," *Demographic Trends and Full Employment*, Special Report 12 (Washington, National

Commission for Manpower Policy, 1976), pp. 77-99.

[3] In its original 1970 form, U* was not a fixed-weight measure, as it incorporated current hours and earnings. In a 1977 article, George L. Perry introduced a "potential" unemployment rate, which differs from that of his 1970 article (though he also indicates using the 1970 version in some of his calculations). See George L. Perry, "Changing Labor Markets and Inflation," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 3:1970*, pp. 411-41; and George L. Perry, "Potential Output and Productivity," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 1:1977* (Washington, The Brookings Institution), pp. 11-47.

[4] See, for example, the Brookings Panel discussion accompanying Wachter's article, "The Changing Cyclical Responsiveness of Wage Inflation," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 1:1976* (Washington, The Brookings Institution, 1976), pp. 115-59.

[5] Wachter, "Changing Cyclical Responsiveness," pp. 126-27.

[6] Milton Friedman, "The Role of Monetary Policy," *The American Economic Review*, March 1968, pp. 1-17; Edmund S. Phelps, "Money Wage Dynamics and Labor Market Equilibrium," in Edmund S. Phelps, ed., *Microeconomic Foundations of Employment and Inflation Theory* (New York, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1970), pp. 124-66; and Cagan, "The Reduction of Inflation."

[7] Daniel S. Hamermesh, *Jobless Pay and the Economy* (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977), p. 49.

[8] Martin Feldstein, *Lowering the Permanent Rate of Unemployment* (Washington, Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, September 1973).

[9] Some studies, as well as some press reports, have failed to distinguish between the two questions and have taken Feldstein's 0.75 percentage point as an estimate of the impact that changes in unemployment insurance have had on the unemployment rate by way of increasing duration.

[10] Cagan, "Reduction of Inflation," p. 34.

[11] Jacob Mincer, "Unemployment Effects of Minimum Wages," *Journal of Political Economy*, August 1976 (part 2), pp. 87-104; Hyman B. Kaitz, "Experience of the Past: The National Minimum," in *Youth Unemployment and Minimum Wages*, Bulletin 1657 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1970), pp. 30-54; and James F. Ragan, Jr., "Minimum Wage Legislation and the Youth Labor Market," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, May 1977, pp. 129-36.

[12] Thomas W. Gavett, "Introduction," in *Youth Unemployment and Minimum Wages*, Bulletin 1657 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1970), pp. 1-29.

[13] Edward Gramlich, "Impact of Minimum Wages on other Wages, Employment, and Family Incomes," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2:1976* (Washington, The Brookings Institution, 1976), pp. 409-51.

[14] Marvin Kosters and Finis Welch, "The Effects of Minimum Wages on the Distribution of Changes in Aggregate Employment," *American Economic Review*, June 1972, pp. 323-32.

[15] Kosters and Welch, op. cit., p. 30.

[16] J. Wilson Mixon, *The Minimum Wage and the Job Package* (Bureau of Labor Statistics Working Paper 32, January 1975).

[17] Robert E. Hall, "Turnover in the Labor Force," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 3:1972* (Washington, The Brookings Institution, 1972), pp. 709-56.

[18] John M. Barron and Wesley Mellow, "Search Effort in the Labor Market," forthcoming in the *Journal of Human Resources*.

[19] The search intensity regression contains as an independent variable, the dollar value of weekly income received during the prior month net of any wage and unemployment insurance benefits received by the individual. A major component of this variable is the weekly earnings of other family members. The estimated coefficient on the income variable is -.004 (Barron and Mellow, table 1). Multiplying this estimate by average weekly earnings in 1976 of $175 yields a reduction of 0.7 hours per week in time spent looking for work. Because mean search time for the sample is 7.1 hours, this translates into approximately a 10-percent reduction in search time.

[20] The 1976 unemployment rate was 7.7 percent and in the jobseeking activities supplement, 55 percent of the unemployed reported other family members were working. The implied reduction in the 1976 rate is thus: [the reduction in the unemployment rate = .10]×[the percent of unemployed with another family member working = .55]×[the 1976 unemployment rate = 7.7] = .42.

[21] Council of Economic Advisors, *Annual Report*, 1976, p. 68.

[22] Kenneth W. Clarkson and Roger E. Meiners, *Inflated Unemployment Statistics: The Effect of Welfare Work Registration Requirements*, (Miami, University of Miami School of Law, Law and Economics Center, March 1977).

[23] Malcolm S. Cohen, "The Direct Effects of Federal Manpower Programs in Reducing Unemployment," *The Journal of Human Resources*, Fall 1969, pp. 491-507; Sylvia S. Small, "Statistical Effect of Work-Training Programs on the Unemployment Rate," *Monthly Labor Review*, September 1972, pp. 7-13; and Ralph E. Smith, "Manpower programs and unemployment statistics," *Monthly Labor Review*, April 1973, pp. 63-65.

[24] Alfred Tella, "Analyzing Joblessness," *The New York Times*, Oct. 27, 1976, Op-Ed page; and *Cyclical Behavior of Bias-Adjusted Unemployment*, Methods for Manpower Analysis 11 (W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, April 1976).